

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1883.

The Week.

THE Nicaragua Canal scheme came up in the House on Monday, in the shape of an attempt to make the bill incorporating the company a special order for February 15. It was defeated, Mr. Perry Belmont pointing out in opposition that although the provision for a Government guarantee of interest has been stricken out, the company takes its concession from the Nicaraguan Government, under a condition which makes it subject to the provision of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty relating to the joint guarantee of neutrality by all Powers who like to join in it. As our Government has signified its intention not to stand by the treaty, the passage of a bill incorporating a company subject to it is clearly out of the question. The chances are that no canal will ever be built under an American charter (unless the Government builds it itself) until the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty is disposed of. Few persons like to invest in a disputed claim or construct canals for belligerents to fight over. On the other hand, it will probably be difficult to get England to modify the treaty till she is sure that, whether she modifies it or not, a canal will be made. In fact, the enterprise seems just now to be in a vicious circle.

The defeat of Mr. Windom in the Senatorial election in Minnesota will be generally regretted by fair-minded men. His long service in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, as well as his brief conduct of the Treasury Department, won for him, in spite of his temporary weakness on the financial question, the reputation of an unusually able, sagacious, and broad-minded man. His public usefulness constantly increased with his experience of public affairs. The attacks made upon his character by his enemies were easily repelled. Whatever his shortcomings may have been, he was conspicuously the fittest man in Minnesota for high representative position, and known as such to the whole American people. It is a pity to see him overthrown by intrigues and attacks of a small and purely personal nature. Minnesota can scarcely fail to lose in character, as well as in the representation of her interests, by the change made.

In commercial and industrial affairs there have been some unfavorable features in the past week, the most notable of which were several important failures, and especially that of the Union Iron and Steel Company at Chicago. There have also been very heavy snows in the Northwest, which have obstructed railway traffic and business generally. The movement of grain at the West has decreased largely during January, partly as the result of the hindrance to traffic caused by the heavy snows, and partly owing to the unwillingness of producers to sell much grain at present prices. On the other hand, the foreign markets for breadstuffs have continued to ad-

vance, and therefore afford the prospect of a continued active demand for our surplus of breadstuffs at fair prices. Cotton, though still at extremely low prices, is being exported freely, and the aggregate weekly export value is in excess of the corresponding week of last year. The money market has been extremely sluggish, and the tendency of rates of interest has been downward. But this was mainly on account of the stagnation in speculation, particularly on the Stock Exchange. The operations of the United States Treasury have absorbed some money in the past week, the coin balance having increased over \$3,000,000, while the associated banks of New York city lost nearly an equal amount. The Secretary of the Treasury, probably assuming that this would continue to be the case, has made a call for \$15,000,000 of the 3½ per cent. bonds (extended 5s) for redemption on May 1. The foreign money markets have been in nearly the same condition as that of New York—viz., dull and at low rates of interest—because of the stagnation in the Stock Exchanges of both London and Paris, as well as New York. There has been but little disposition in London and on the Continent to buy American securities, though there has been a little more evidence of it in the last day or two than for a week previous. The balance of foreign trade on the exchange of commodities alone is so nearly even that the rates of foreign exchange are now governed almost exclusively by the probabilities of foreign buying of American securities; and as there have been no considerable purchases in the past week, the rates of exchange have remained almost uncharged. The general tendency of prices of stocks has been downward, the decline in the week ranging from 1 to 5½ per cent. on the general list of stocks.

The failure of the Union Iron and Steel Company at Chicago, and that of the Kansas Rolling Mills at Rosedale, a suburb of Kansas City, should set unprejudiced minds to inquire more seriously into the truthfulness of the talk which represents a high tariff as a protection against the breaking down of industrial enterprise. Nobody will pretend that the establishments that have just failed did not belong to the highly-protected class. The industries they pursued were indeed among the few most favored. They had certainly not to suffer from foreign competition. We do not understand it to be alleged that their business management was either dishonest or negligent. They enjoyed all the advantages which a high protective tariff can afford. But it can scarcely be doubtful that just these artificial advantages were among the most important causes of their downfall, for they were of just that class of which so faithful a friend of the protective system as the *Tribune* recently observed that they were "stimulated to an unnatural growth in productive power." For a while the protective tariff enabled them to distribute enormous dividends among their stockholders. Their managers thought they saw a chance for more by expansion. They expanded to an

unnatural degree under the stimulus of the tariff, and here they are. The workingmen who were employed in those establishments are turned into the street. We are told that the protective tariff is made for their especial benefit. It does not appear to protect them against being turned out without work and sustenance now that the establishments have failed. Neither did it formerly give them any share of the enormous dividends distributed among the stockholders. They had to content themselves with the market price of labor. We certainly do not mean to say that industrial establishments will not sometimes break down under a better revenue system. But we do mean to say that the high protective tariff, when represented as a system that can be relied upon to prevent such disasters, is a delusion and a snare.

The *Albany Evening Journal*, in the course of an article comparing wages in this country with those in England, and showing that there is not nearly so much difference as is commonly supposed, although money goes much further there than here, and that protection has really nothing to do with the amount paid, makes this striking observation:

"Bricklayers and carpenters get better pay than weavers and miners. We all know that. Yet the former are not mentioned in any tariff scheme, and the others are alleged to get all the benefits of protection. We pay our printers higher wages than a like number of operatives in the Harmony Mills of Cohoes ever got. Yet type-setting is not under the shadow of protection's Chinese wall, and spinning is."

The *Evening Journal*, by the way, is one of many of our Republican contemporaries whose views on the tariff have undergone a marked change of late. The fact is that the day has passed when blind adherence to protective notions could be insisted upon as a test of party orthodoxy. Attention is sometimes directed to the fact that many Democratic leaders and newspapers seem to have fallen away from the old economic doctrine which used to be fundamental to the Democratic faith. This might be more discouraging but for the other fact that there has been a marked advance among Republicans in a liberal direction. The truth is, that opinion in favor of revenue reform is not controlled by partisan lines, but is gaining strength among all intelligent citizens, no matter what their party proclivities may have been heretofore. We congratulate our Albany contemporary upon the emancipation from the protective tyranny which has followed so soon after its declaration of independence of bosses and machines. The results of larger freedom are seen in the energy and earnestness of conviction with which it discusses the foremost questions of the time, and which cannot fail to commend it to the growing number of thinking and independent Republicans.

It appears that the bill relating to Niagara Falls, recently introduced in the Legislature, is in the nature of an inquiry, and that, upon the report of the Commissioners to be appointed, it will still remain for the Legislature to

give effect to its recommendations. This would probably throw the matter over to another session, with the chance of further delay. Meanwhile the destruction of the natural features of the Falls would go on. It is desirable to avoid this, if possible. Of course care should be taken not to incur unnecessary expenditure, but it is quite likely that delay would increase instead of diminishing the cost of the measure. In twelve months "enterprise" could do a great deal to "improve" the neighborhood, and the additional improvements would have to be paid for. It is understood that manufacturers and mill-owners are organizing an opposition to the bill. The sooner this opposition is encountered the better. With every year's delay the number of factories and mills will multiply, the vested interests will grow larger, and the force of the opposition will increase accordingly. Objection also is made by some of the taxpayers of the village of Niagara Falls, who fear that the withdrawal of considerable property from assessment will impose additional burdens upon them. The sooner this objection also is met the better. The value of the land which the State contemplates buying increases every year, and the amount of taxable property withdrawn will increase, of course. Whatever force there may be in the opposition will gather strength with the lapse of time. If it is really intended to set apart a State reservation at Niagara Falls, the matter ought to be settled at this session. If suitable men are selected for Commissioners, the Legislature might safely appropriate the money for the work now, fixing the maximum of expense at the limit already informally ascertained.

"The New York Nation is engaged in the difficult task of attempting to demonstrate that the best classes of society in the South are composed of murderers. This is an old story about the South, reiterated for many years by Republican journals, until many of them grew tired of it and stopped it some time ago. The Nation, however, has started a fresh crusade in the old Chicago *Inter-Ocean* style, claiming that murder in the North is a very rare thing, and murder by persons outside the slums an impossibility. The criminal statistics of the Northern States of course flatly contradict the Nation's theory, and Northern newspapers in their daily recital of local crime do so also. The position of the Nation is a very absurd one, and we are astonished that a journal, ordinarily fair in its criticisms of the South, should take it. It even cited a stabbing affair at a low negro ball in Virginia, the other day, as evidence of the depravity of Southern gentlemen in first-class society."—*Louisville Courier-Journal*.

This is gross and reckless misrepresentation of the Nation. We are not "attempting to demonstrate that the best classes of society in the South are composed of murderers," but to show to the Southern people, from the columns of their own papers, that there is more homicide practised there by men called gentlemen than is good for their fair name as well as their material prosperity, and that they had better stop it. We have never thought of asserting that murder is a very rare thing in the North, but that homicides among the better classes, committed for social or business reasons, are more rare here than in the South, and that all kinds of murder are far more apt to be punished according to law. The "stabbing affair at a negro ball in Virginia," of which the *Courier-Journal* speaks, was first discussed in accordance with the telegraphic report received

by the Associated Press; but we put it at once in its correct light as soon as its true character became known.

The decision of Judge Van Vorst in Mr. Loubat's suit against the Union Club is of considerable interest, not only to the Club, but to the public at large. Mr. Loubat was turned out of the Club by the Governing Committee, which has power to expel "for conduct improper and prejudicial to the Club." By one of the rules the proceedings of this committee must be "strictly private." The Treasurer of the Club, Mr. Leroy, who was a member of the committee, was examined as a witness before trial, and produced the minutes of the proceedings in the case. He was asked by Mr. Loubat's counsel a number of questions, the object of which was to bring out the motives that actuated him in voting for the expulsion of Mr. Loubat. Some of the questions were as follows: "What conduct on the part of Mr. Loubat did you, as a member of the Governing Committee, deem to be improper and prejudicial to the Club? For what cause did you vote for the expulsion of Mr. Loubat? Did you, as a member of the Governing Committee, deem the fact that Mr. Loubat had in private conversation in the club-house used improper language a cause for expulsion?" Judge Van Vorst's decision is that such a line of inquiry "violates the sanctity of such proceedings, and would disturb their efficiency, and is clearly opposed to the policy out of which such investigations originate and by which they are to be conducted." The English courts have decided—and with their decisions Judge Van Vorst's opinion is in accord—that every member of a club has property interests which he may call upon the courts to protect; that he cannot be turned out of a club, at least unless it has unusual features in its constitution, without some sort of trial, which involves notice, an opportunity of meeting the charges against him, etc. But one of the main objects of a club is that its life shall be just as little public as the family life of its members; that if differences or disputes occur between its members they shall be settled within doors. Now, obviously this cannot be done if a member who is disciplined for improper behavior has the right to send for a judge to see whether the club or its committee understand what improper conduct is, and to tell them what may or may not be done among gentlemen.

The increased observance of Lent in New York during the past twenty-five years is a phenomenon generally attributed to the growth of the Episcopal and Catholic churches; and probably the same thing is noticeable in other parts of the country. For fashionable people it is an institution which has great attractions, notwithstanding the "bad jokes" which, according to the *Tribune*, circulate every year with regard to their doings during Lent. These jokes are founded on the idea favorite among scoffers that the religious observances of those who carry on "society" are more or less a sham and pretence, and that it is absurd for people devoted to the pomps and vanities of the gay world to suddenly become devout for a few weeks, fast, go to church on week days, and refuse, ac-

cording to one of the traditional jokes, to dance "on a crash." We have no doubt that Lent has an excellent sanitary effect, and, whatever it does for the soul of society, gives its body a chance of periodic rest, which it much needs. Society in New York, it should be remembered, is managed, not by people in mature life, who can stand a prolonged strain, but by very young girls and boys, who, having thrown aside all parental restraint, and being passionately fond of excitement, would keep it up all through the winter if the Church did not interfere to check their excesses. From this point of view all sects and denominations may rejoice in Lent.

The trouble at Annapolis seems to be the sort of trouble that might spring up in any military school where the master enforces an unpopular system of discipline. The Superintendent, Captain Ramsay, has introduced a "demerit" system which the cadets resent as degrading. In addition to this, Cadet Woodruff has been deprived of his cadet rank for certifying, on his honor, that he had not rendered any assistance at an examination to any cadet, when, as a matter of fact, he had written out solutions of half the questions proposed, and taken means to bring them within reach of his fellow-pupils. A large number of the students have been placed under arrest for expressing sympathy with Mr. Woodruff and other cadets who have been disciplined. They have now resorted to the columns of the *Herald* to state their case, which is a very improper thing for them to do; and their sympathy with Mr. Woodruff seems uncalled for, as his case evidently merited severe punishment. The affair will probably, however, make an inquiry into the system of discipline adopted by the Superintendent seem necessary.

The probabilities are now that the bill empowering the Government to expel pretenders from France will be defeated in the Senate, and to the hearty satisfaction of all but the Extremists of the Left. Discussion has had a most destructive effect on the whole scheme. People are ashamed of the alarm into which Prince Napoleon's manifesto threw the Assembly. They are ashamed of the notion that the Republic can be endangered by placards. Moreover, exceptional legislation, directed against individual officers—like the Orleanist Princes, whom it is proposed to put on the retired list, not because they are old, or incompetent, or culpable, but because they are dangerous—is said to be viewed with great disfavor in the army, as an exercise of power which puts every officer's commission in peril. The *Temps*, the ablest and calmest of the Republican journals, argues powerfully and with ill-concealed scorn, that if individuals are to be exposed to "exceptional legislation" because they are supposed to be dangerous to the state, where is it to end? In the opinion of many, great wealth, or great talents or ambition make a man dangerous to the state. Gambetta was considered by many far more dangerous than any of the pretenders. Many, too, consider all persons holding Socialist opinions danger-

ous to the state. Is there to be legislation empowering the Government to expel from the country everybody whom it singles out as likely by his presence to imperil republican institutions?

Mr. Chamberlain has answered his colleague Lord Hartington's assertion that nothing more is to be said about Irish Home Rule, and that the Irish question is practically closed, by the counter assertion that a good deal more is to be both said and done about the causes of Irish discontent, including, of course, Home Rule. This little incident has attracted a good deal of attention in England, as showing how much discordance Mr. Gladstone probably keeps down, and, indeed, how potent his influence as a leader must be to make it possible for both Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Hartington to serve under him. During the Liberal opposition Mr. Chamberlain made no attempt to disguise his reluctance to accept Lord Hartington's leadership, and indeed his doubts as to the genuineness of Lord Hartington's liberalism. The old divergence of sentiment and opinion has been suppressed, but evidently not extirpated, by Mr. Gladstone's leadership. We may be sure that whenever Mr. Gladstone ceases to lead, it will break out again and make a Whig-Radical combination impossible. But this is not the only sign of the trouble that is to come in the Liberal ranks whenever Mr. Gladstone quits the scene. Sir Charles Dilke has been making speeches to his constituents, which seem to show that not only has he got over his Republicanism, but that he is getting over some of his Radicalism. He is marked out in all sorts of ways for the Liberal leadership in the House of Commons after Mr. Gladstone's retirement. Lord Hartington must, in the course of nature, before very long go up to the House of Lords on the death of his father, the Duke of Devonshire, and no one sitting in the House of Peers can exert much influence in the Liberal party as it is now made up. Even if he retained the title of leader, the real authority would go to his lieutenant in the lower house, and that lieutenant Sir Charles Dilke will be.

Sir Charles is still young, very able, full of political information, in possession of a considerable fortune, without which the highest success is not possible in British politics, and is an orator of great power. Now that he has got into the Cabinet—which is to an English politician as important as getting the Governorship or the Senatorship of his own State is to an American politician—all things seem not only attainable to him, but within easy reach. When, the other day, therefore, he defined the true function of the Radicals, with whom he has hitherto acted, to be "the permeation" of the Liberal party with Radical ideas, and not the formation of a distinct critical and exacting group, and condemned their tactics in the past as erroneous, he caused great alarm and dissatisfaction in Birmingham and Manchester and other Radical centres. Even the *Pall Mall Gazette* condemns his language in no very measured terms. It ridicules the work of "permeation" as one which the Radicals could never have accomplished in the past. It denies that the Whig element in the Liberal

party could be either permeated or persuaded by Radicals who did not act together as a critical and hostile minority, determined to have its way, or to make it very unpleasant if it did not; and predicts that the tactics which have had in the past such marked and valuable effects on Liberal policy will have to be persisted in.

This is probably all very true. If the Radicals had confined themselves to moral suasion, they would have had about as much influence on the Whigs as the Parnellites would have had on the House of Commons if they had continued to make that old annual statement, about the wrongs of Ireland, which the majority used to dispose of so neatly by a division without debate. It was by showing their teeth, or making it hot for the Conservative wing, that they forced a Radical programme on the party and secured a seat in the Cabinet for their most prominent member. Sir Charles Dilke's condemnation of this policy, which he himself helped to carry out, is, therefore, naturally looked on as a sign that he thinks it necessary for the success of his own career to separate himself from his old associates. But his old associates are evidently not disposed to take this performance in good part, or to take up the work of "permeation" with any zeal; and Sir Charles Dilke is probably, in proposing it to them, making the only mistake which could mar his fortunes. It will be easily seen, however, from all this on what a volcanic region Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet is built.

There seems to be very little doubt that the Government in Ireland at last has the murderers of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke in its grasp, and that this and other assassinations in and about Dublin were the work of one large band, composed principally of rather intelligent mechanics, who deliberately undertook the task of intimidating both the Government officials and the police, courts, and juries. They are evidently a sort of outcome or sequel of the Fenian organization, and have that readiness to take life under the orders of a secret society which has so long been a striking feature of Irish disorder and discontent, and has now apparently spread to the Continent. But nothing whatever has yet appeared to show that there was any connection between these conspirators and the Land League, or in fact that they had any respect whatever for the Land League agitation. The history of the Molly Maguires in Pennsylvania proves that it is very easy to organize assassination societies among a certain class of Irishmen, simply as a means of cowering authority of any kind, or of getting rid of private enemies. In fact, this readiness to conspire to assassinate seems to have become a disease of the Irish mind, very like the brigandage in Sicily and Greece. In both these countries there is apparently no class of the community which does not contain sympathizers with or confederates of brigands, and, in both, brigand means murderer in case of necessity. Curiously enough, however, the Irish assassin rarely robs his victim, or murders him with the view of robbing him, and probably manages to dignify his doings with some glamour of patriot-

ism. Even the Pennsylvania Molly Maguires had a dig at England and Gladstone in their passwords; and some doubtless flattered themselves that in shooting overseers and contractors they were in some manner giving greatness and terror to the Irish name.

The Dublin revelations are nevertheless placing the Land League agitators in a very embarrassing position. One of the strongest traditions of Irish agitation makes it necessary to treat all Government prosecutions for offences of a political or agrarian character as unfair, owing to the corruption and partisanship of everybody connected with them, including the juries. No Irish agitator or popular leader dares openly to avow that he thinks anybody has been fairly tried for a political or agrarian murder or outrage. Consequently the Land Leaguers have to suppress all expressions of satisfaction that the Dublin assassins have been found out, lest they should seem to admit that the courts will give them justice and at the same time have to suppress all expressions of sympathy with them, lest they should seem to approve of assassination. The Government is not helping them out of their scrape by its way of executing the Repression Act in other directions. The local authorities have been using the arbitrary powers conferred on them by the law in a way which is lamentably calculated to deprive the Dublin prosecutions of all moral weight. Severe sentences have been summarily inflicted for trifling indiscretions of speech, and the extraordinary spectacle has been presented to the people of three or four editors and reporters of provincial papers, sentenced to imprisonment for refusal to disperse at a meeting on the summons of the police, marching through the streets handcuffed, in convict's dress, and with their clothes in bundles under their arms. In fact, if half what is told is true, the worst fears of the English Radicals as to the possible abuses of the Act are being realized. The crusade against the press and the platform seems to be as fierce as under Mr. Forster's Coercion Bill, and it can be defended, and is defended, only on the plea that crime in Ireland cannot be suppressed without the suppression of free speech also.

The Court of Cassation in France has struck a heavy blow at the Silver Convention of the Latin Union. That convention gave free circulation to the silver coins of each country of the Union in all the other countries of the Union, which includes France, Italy, Switzerland, and Belgium. A French creditor, having refused to receive Swiss silver in payment of his debts from another Frenchman, was tried for it under the law which makes the refusal to receive the national coins punishable with fine or imprisonment. The Court directed his acquittal, on the ground that the Monetary Convention did not modify the law so as to bring all Latin silver within its operation. The Public Prosecutor appealed, but the Court of Cassation has confirmed the decision of the court below. It is feared that the effect of this decision will be virtually to abrogate the Monetary Convention as far as France is concerned.

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

[WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 31, TO THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1883, INCLUSIVE.]

DOMESTIC.

THE reduction of the public debt of the United States in the month of January amounted to a little more than \$13,500,000, making the reduction for the first seven months of the current fiscal year \$95,000,000, or an average monthly reduction of \$13,570,000. This continuance of the large monthly reduction was mainly owing to an unexpected falling off in the expenses, notably in the current expenses of the Pension Bureau. The customs receipts were greater by \$2,000,000 than those of December, but the internal-revenue receipts fell off about \$500,000. The expenditures for the month were about \$2,000,000 greater than those of December. On Thursday the Secretary of the Treasury issued another call for continued 5 per cent. bonds of 1881, the amount embraced in the call being \$15,000,000.

Two large failures occurred during the week. The Kansas Rolling Mills, in the suburb of Rosedale, Mo., were closed on Saturday. For the past three months the mills have been somewhat embarrassed, influenced, it is said, by the general depression in the iron trade, and for two months they have been running on reduced time. The stock is owned chiefly by A. B. Stone, of New York; and Amasa Stone, W. R. Harris, and D. Teets, of Cleveland. Mr. A. B. Stone is the President. The Trustees have taken possession of the works. The liabilities, secured and unsecured, are \$600,000. The assets, the officers state, are ample to cover all indebtedness, the plant being worth about half a million. The lumber-manufacturing firm of Ferry & Brother, of Grand Haven, Mich., the head of the house being Senator Ferry, who is now seeking a reelection at the hands of the Michigan Legislature, has also failed. The liabilities, it is thought, will amount to upward of \$500,000, contracted in large part by the failure of the firm's Utah mines.

There have been great floods during this week in Western Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana. The railroads have suffered much damage by washouts and ruined bridges, and parts of the towns of Fremont and Defiance in Ohio, Allegheny City and Pittsburg in Pennsylvania, and Wheeling, W. Virginia, have been submerged. Reports from Central Ohio show the highest water by from six to twenty inches ever known there. Along the Scioto Valley alone the damage is roughly estimated at \$1,000,000. Some lives were lost and thousands of people rendered homeless, some in a destitute condition. One of the results of the floods was the igniting of oil at the Standard Oil Works in Cleveland, Ohio, which threatened for a while to cause a great conflagration, as the burning oil was carried through the flooded parts of the city on the surface of the water. On Monday the fire in the neighborhood of the oil works had been practically extinguished.

The Senate continued the debate on the Tariff Bill on Wednesday. The sugar question consumed most of the session. In the afternoon both houses adjourned early out of respect to the memory of the late Godlove S. Orth, of Indiana. The tobacco and provision schedules of the Tariff Bill were discussed on Thursday and Friday. On Saturday and Monday the Senate got through the jute and hemp schedules and began on the wool schedule.

The House also has continued its seemingly interminable debate on the tariff during the week. There seems to be little hope of a Tariff Bill being passed this session. Monday being the day set apart for suspension of the rules, the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Bill was called up, but a motion for its immediate consideration was lost by a vote of 176 to 108.

The House of Representatives accomplished little on Tuesday. The Democrats filibustered

against the Tariff Bill. In the Senate the woollen schedule of the Tariff Bill was considered.

The Pension Appropriation Bill, as agreed upon by the Appropriation Committee, was reported to the Senate on Saturday. The bill contains only one amendment by the Senate committee. It appropriates \$86,575,000, and reappropriates \$15,800,000 of unexpended balances of former appropriations, now in the Treasury.

The House Committee on Military Affairs has practically agreed upon a bill to place General Grant upon the retired list of the Army, with the rank of General.

The annual statement of the organized and unorganized military force of the United States was sent to Congress by the Secretary of War on Saturday. It showed the number of commissioned officers to be 6,583; non-commissioned officers, musicians, and privates, 81,031; number of men available for military duty, 6,797,006.

Under the new treaty which it is proposed to make with the Sioux Indians, the Government, in addition to giving 320 acres of land to the head of each family and eighty acres to each minor child, stipulates to furnish to each Indian settlement a physician, carpenter, miller, engineer, farmer, and blacksmith for a period of ten years. On their part, the Sioux surrender between 17,000 and 18,000 square miles of their former reservation, and agree not to sell or slaughter for sale the cows and oxen to be furnished them by the Government unless by permission of the Interior Department.

The term of office of Messrs. Burt and Graham, Naval Officer and Surveyor, respectively, of the Port of New York, will expire on the 7th instant, but it has been decided to make no change in these offices until the President has appointed the Civil Service Commissioners, who, it is expected, will be appointed in a few days.

A public meeting was held in the rooms of the Mercantile Exchange, in New York, on Saturday, for the purpose of considering the matter of petitioning Congress to legislate against the circulation of trade-dollars. Speeches were made by several merchants, who dwelt on the inconvenience and loss occasioned to a large class of people by the trade-dollar.

A revolt took place among the first-class cadets of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis on Wednesday. A few days previous Cadet Woodruff was reported for dishonorable conduct in certifying in connection with an examination paper to a falsehood. He was arrested and made a confession in writing of his fault. Being a cadet petty officer, he was immediately reduced to the ranks. When this became known, as he was very popular, Cadet Lieutenant Street, of his division, led his fellow-cadets in cheering for the culprit while the Superintendent and other officers were within hearing. The Lieutenant was immediately arrested. Other insubordination followed, and a number of other cadets were arrested and put on board of the *man-of-war Santee*.

On Wednesday, on the seventeenth joint ballot, Gen. C. F. Manderson, having received 75 votes, was elected United States Senator from Nebraska. On Thursday the deadlock in the Minnesota Legislature was broken, and D. M. Sabin was elected Senator from that State to succeed Mr. Windom. The result was brought about by the action of the Democratic caucus, which agreed to give up its candidate when 35 Republican votes should be cast for any candidate except Windom. Mr. Sabin is a business man of ability, and is at the head of the Northwestern Car Factory at Stillwater. He has been one of the most successful politicians of Minnesota, and is a member of the State Legislature.

It is announced that Mr. James G. Blaine has been for some time past preparing a politi-

cal history under the title of 'Twenty Years of Congress, from Lincoln to Garfield. A History of National Legislation from 1861 to 1881.'

The Massachusetts Republican State Committee organized on Wednesday for the year, with young men in the leading places and old leaders on committees with them. Henry Cabot Lodge was made Chairman; Edwin B. Hale, Chairman of the Executive Committee; Henry N. Sawyer, Chairman of the Finance Committee; and George A. Flagg, Secretary of the General Committee.

The State Treasurer of Alabama, Isaac H. Vincent, has been found to be a defaulter to the amount of \$212,687. The discovery was made on Wednesday, and on the preceding Monday Vincent left Montgomery and has not since been heard from. Most of the money went in cotton speculations. Attachments were levied on all his property in Montgomery, which amounts, however, to only about \$15,000 in value. Vincent abstracted his bond and the book in which it was recorded from the Auditor's office, evidently with the object of protecting his bondsmen, but it is stated that the contents of the bond can be established by secondary evidence so as to fix their liability.

The Grand Jury at Washington on Thursday found an indictment against Henry A. Bowen, for corruptly endeavoring to influence the Star-route juror, William Dickson.

One of the most disastrous snow-slides ever known in the Rocky Mountain regions occurred near Crested Butte, Colorado, on Wednesday night. Thirty men, employed in a coal mine, were sleeping in a building which was crushed to atoms as it was buried down the mountain side by the avalanche. Seven were killed and eighteen injured, several fatally.

The coroner's jury at Milwaukee, Wis., rendered a verdict in the investigation of the Newhall House disaster on Monday afternoon. They found the proprietor of the house guilty of culpable negligence in not employing a sufficient number of watchmen to guard the house against fire and to awaken the inmates in time to save all the lives possible. They found the Newhall House easy of egress and devoid of intricate passages. Nevertheless, they found the owner of the house guilty of negligence in not having provided more escapes in case of fire.

The steamboat *Old Colony*, of the Fall River Line, bound from Newport for New York, went ashore on Hart's Island, in Long Island Sound, at about eight o'clock on Sunday morning. The passengers and some of the more perishable freight were taken off by the *City of Lawrence*, of the Norwich Line.

At a meeting of the Board of Trustees of Columbia College, New York, on Monday, a petition signed by 1,352 persons was received from the Association for Promoting the Higher Education of Women. The petition asks the Trustees to extend the educational privileges of Columbia College to such women as desire and deserve them, under such restrictions as the Trustees shall deem best.

Professor George W. Greene died at East Greenwich, Rhode Island, on Friday. He was born in 1811. He was the author of a number of historical works, chiefly relating to the history of the United States.

The United States Consul at Amsterdam wrote to the State Department that no person in the United States had asked him for any information about the approaching International Exposition in that city, and that only six firms in this country had engaged space in the Fair building. He says that there is considerable disappointment in Holland at the failure of the United States to take more interest in the Exhibition.

FOREIGN.

A heated debate took place in the French Chamber of Deputies, on Thursday, on M.

Fabre's compromise bill in regard to the Orleans Princes. The bill was finally passed by a vote of 343 to 163, and the Chamber adjourned for a week. In the debate the right persisted in an organized system of obstruction. M. Fabre's bill as passed consists of three clauses: the first prohibits the Princes from filling any civil or military post; the second empowers the President to decree their expulsion; and the third enacts a penalty of from one to five years' imprisonment for a violation of such decree. General Thibaudin explained in the debate that the bill did not strike the Princes from the Army roll, but only removed them from active service, leaving them their rank. In the French Senate, on Friday, the bill relative to oaths in courts of justice was passed, with an amendment that a jurymen can demand the suppression of the formula "Before God and man" in taking the oath. An important modification in the bill, as finally passed, was the suppression of the clause ordering the removal of religious emblems from courts of justice. There seems to be little chance of the Expulsion Bill passing the Senate, as of the committee on the bill eight members are opposed to it and only one is in favor of it. Public uneasiness in France is said to be increasing. The preliminary examination of Prince Jerome Napoleon having been concluded, he will shortly be arraigned on an indictment for an attempt to overthrow the existing régime, and it is expected that his case will be decided within a week.

A meeting of Socialists was held in Marseilles on Sunday, at which about one hundred persons, including a number of women, were present. Resolutions were adopted strongly condemning the Lyons tribunal which convicted Prince Krapotkine and his fellow-prisoners. The proceedings were turbulent, and terminated amid cries of "Vive la Révolution internationale."

The examination of the men recently arrested on the charge of entering into a conspiracy to murder Government officials was resumed in Dublin on Saturday. The court-room was densely crowded and the excitement great. The Clerk of the Court read the charge against them, which was to the effect that, on the 6th of May last, James Carey, a member of the Corporation; Joseph Brady, a stone-cutter; Edward O'Brien, a shoemaker; Edward McCaffery, a car driver; Peter Carey, a mason; Lawrence Hanlon, a carpenter; Peter Doyle, a coach-builder, and Timothy Kelly, a coach-builder, murdered Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke. The reading of the charge was greeted by the prisoners with a burst of loud laughter. The evidence produced against Carey was that he had been the lessor of a room in which two knives and a rifle had been found, and that the cuts in the clothes of the murdered men and their wounds had been inflicted by instruments similar to the above-mentioned knives, which were produced in court. The evidence against O'Brien and McCaffery was that they had been looking about the scene of the murder shortly before it was committed. Brady was identified as the driver of the car upon which the assassins rode. On Monday the examination was resumed, and evidence introduced against the prisoners accused of attempting to kill Mr. Field. A little girl identified a man named Kavanagh as the driver of the car which contained the men who intended to assassinate Mr. Field. The identification was complete. Several more men, including Kavanagh, were added to the list of those charged with the murder of Lord Cavendish and Mr. Burke. The evidence against the prisoners on this day was not particularly important. Some sensation was caused by the reading of extracts from books found in a Fenian armory.

Earl Spencer has appointed the period between the 14th of February and the 7th of March for hearing appeals under the Crimes Act. The Bishop of Killala has issued a pas-

toral letter condemning secret societies. Reports of deaths from starvation in various parts of Ireland are beginning to be received.

Warrants have been issued for the arrest of Messrs. Davitt, Healy, and Quinn. Mr. Healy, in consequence of his impending imprisonment, intends to resign his seat in Parliament. The Dublin Grand Jury has returned a true bill for seditious libel against Mr. O'Brien, editor of the *United Ireland*.

Mr. Chamberlain, President of the Board of Trade, speaking at a banquet at Swansea, England, Thursday evening, said the next session of Parliament would be an interesting but not an exciting one. Matters relating to England and Scotland demanded consideration. He believed the recent measures passed would bring about a settled state of affairs in Ireland.

It is understood that the new Egyptian representative Assembly will meet soon to advise the Government on proposed internal reforms. The Khedive's decrees appointing Sir Auckland Colvin financial adviser to the Egyptian Government and naming the members of the Indemnity Commission have been published. The Commission includes the diplomatic agents of England, Austria, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, the United States, and Greece, and is under the presidency of Abdurrahman Pasha, Arabi's Minister of Finance.

The German military officers in the employ of the Porte have drawn up a plan for the reorganization of the Turkish Army, by which great improvements will be effected, as it retires a swarm of useless officers and devotes their pay to more useful purposes. It is understood that the Sultan has expressed his entire concurrence in the views expressed in the report of the officers.

The Pope has returned a very conciliatory answer to the German Emperor William's letter. It is hoped that a direct and personal understanding will soon be reached on the basis of a complete revision of the May laws, with concessions on the part of the Vatican upon the question of obtaining the previous consent of the German Government to all ecclesiastical appointments. The Berlin *Germania* (Ultramontane), discussing the Emperor's letter to the Pope, proclaims it injustice to conclude a peace by which the Empire would derive greater benefit than the Church. The Berlin *Reichs-Zeitung* says the Emperor's letter has produced a painful impression in Catholic circles.

By command of the Emperor, Prince Bismarck has sent a letter to the German Consuls and other diplomatic agents in the United States concerning the collecting and forwarding of subscriptions for the relief of the sufferers by the recent floods, in which he says that the Emperor has learned with keen interest how general was the sympathy awakened among the Germans in America for the sufferings of the residents of the inundated districts, and that he is much gratified by this proof of the feeling of kinship which citizens of the German race abroad entertain for their countrymen in the old home, and which corresponds with the friendly relations existing between the Governments of Germany and the United States. In conclusion, the Emperor warmly thanks the committee which had in charge the matter of collecting the funds.

In the German Reichstag, on Thursday, Herr Sonnemann asked whether, in consequence of the disaster to the steamship *Cimbria*, the Government proposed to make any international arrangements to prevent collisions at sea. He advocated the introduction of the electric light for that purpose. Herr Scholz, replying in his capacity as Federal Commissioner, said the Government felt the same sympathy as the nation with the sufferers by the recent disaster, and had also a sense of its responsibility. The Government could not immediately answer the interpellation, but would keep the subject in view.

An official inquiry had been instituted, and until a result was reached the Government must reserve its decision.

A number of Danish subjects in North Schleswig, Prussia, having objected to military service in the German Army, the Danish Government has made representations to Prussia pointing out that by the Danish law all German Schleswig-Holsteiners inhabiting Denmark are especially exempted.

A German emigration return presented to the Reichstag shows a decrease of 16,000 in the year 1882, as compared with the previous year, and that 168,454 emigrants passed through Hamburg, Bremen, and Stettin, mostly for the United States. This was exclusive of 63,756 foreigners.

A despatch from Berlin says that M. de Giers, on reassuming the direction of the Russian Foreign Office, issued a circular to the Russian representatives abroad, explaining that the result of his personal exchange of opinion with the German, Austrian, and Italian Foreign Ministers was satisfactory, and tended to the preservation of peace.

A solemn warning, printed on fine vellum, has reached the Czar and the members of the Russian Cabinet, claiming universal suffrage, the right of the people to own land, freedom of conscience, of the press, and of public meeting. If these demands are not granted before the coronation of the Czar, the Revolutionary Committee sending the warning threaten to revert to intimidation.

The Czar has issued his manifesto giving notice of his coronation at Moscow on the 27th of May. The manifesto is addressed "to all Russian subjects." An ukase orders the attendance at Moscow, on the occasion of the coronation, of all marshals of the nobility and prefects of provincial capitals except those of Siberia, whose attendance is excused on account of distance, and the presidents of the rural and urban administrations. The Minister of the Household is charged with the duty of making the necessary preparations. He will be assisted by a special commission.

The London *Times*, in an editorial commenting on the Czar's manifesto, says that much too little attention has been attracted by the subsidence of the revolutionary storm, and the reassertion of ascendancy by the permanent forces of Russian society. It says that the events of the last few weeks indicate the break-up, for the present at least, of the Nihilist conspiracies.

In the Spanish Cortes on Thursday night Señor Pedregal (Republican), an ex-Minister, moved that the most-favored-nation treatment be accorded to the various countries, including England and the United States, that desire to make treaties of commerce. Señor Armijo, Foreign Minister, opposed the motion as prejudicial to Spanish interests, and asked authority from the Congress to negotiate with the various governments which should offer suitable compensation. Señor Pedregal's motion was rejected by a vote of 112 to 18. On Saturday the Chamber of Deputies discussed the new parliamentary-oath formula. Señor Sagasta, in replying to objections to the oath raised by some of the Deputies, expressed admiration for the procedure of England in all the acts of her political life, which rendered her a privileged nation as regarded liberty, prosperity, and grandeur. Señor Sagasta wished Spain would follow England's example. He insisted upon the necessity of the oath, or an equivalent therefor. The motion for the abolition of the oath was finally rejected by a vote of 162 to 13, and the Chamber adjourned until the 8th instant.

The Spanish Government has issued a ministerial circular, ordering the adoption throughout the country of the decimal metrical system of weights and measures.

Cetywayo has been reinstalled as King of Zululand. Many of the chiefs express great dissatisfaction at the terms on which he has been restored.

THE PROTECTIONIST PANIC.

THERE was a studied attempt, at the meeting at Cooper Union on Thursday evening, to put the revenue-reform movement in a false position. It was assailed as a movement for free trade, especially free trade in the interest of Great Britain. Few will be deceived by this. Nobody calls for the repeal of all tariff laws and the instant closing of custom-houses. No representative revenue reformer fails to recognize existing facts, or proposes to put out of view the interests which have grown up under our economic policy. A sentence from Mr. Evarts's own speech might well serve for a revenue-reform text. Referring to the questions upon which the people expressed an opinion at the last election, the speaker said that one of them related to the political managers, and that another declaration at the polls was to the effect "that exactions were not to be made or persisted in at the expense of the people, in the accumulation of revenue that it might be expended in wasteful and profligate jobs." Here is a starting point. The revenue is too large. It should be reduced. Upon what plan should it be reduced? The tariff reformers say, by lopping off excessive duties that go to the enrichment of favored industries which, even according to the protective notion, receive far more protection than is needed to put them on a competitive equality with foreign manufacturers; by simplifying the tax-laws and wiping out their many shams and abuses; and, above all, by relieving raw materials from extravagant duties, so as to give manufacturers genuine protection, enabling them to manufacture more cheaply, and thereby to obtain a footing in the world's markets which their European rivals now monopolize. This is not free trade. This is not in the interest of Great Britain. It is in the interest of American workingmen, and of American capital in the broad sense, since it would largely widen and multiply the profitable opportunities of both.

Having misrepresented revenue reform as an absolute free-trade movement, the meeting misrepresented history by asserting that the commercial crises and labor troubles of the past were the consequence of efforts to enforce the free-trade principle. It would be easy to refute this assertion in detail, but it is not necessary to go further back than ten years. There has been no worse crisis than that of 1873. Did it happen under a free-trade policy? Before the panic occurred, while it lasted, and during the years of slow and painful recovery, the high war tariff was in full operation—the same tariff which is still in force, and which threatens to bring about another and similar period of distress; a tariff which, by applying an artificial and excessive impulse, endangers the very interests which it aims to promote. But the summit of absurdity was reached by the resolutions adopted when they touched the question of the foreign carrying-trade. Here is something about which it is impossible to deceive the people, to whom many tariff matters are mysteries. The operation of duties upon particular interests is often understood only by experts. But anybody with two eyes, or even one, can see for himself that the carrying-trade has gone out

of our own hands and into those of foreign ship-owners. Has this happened under a free-trade policy? On the contrary, it is a conspicuous illustration of the working of the opposite system. The protectionists have had their own way here. As to other articles they say, You shall only import them upon paying a heavy duty; but as to ships they say, You shall not import them at all. The result is that we have no ships. Yet, in full view of the destruction of American shipping under the navigation laws, the meeting resolved "in favor of restoring ocean navigation under our flag," but only "in American-built ships." That is, it insisted upon holding fast to a narrow system under which, as has been already proved, American ocean navigation cannot revive.

We ought, however, to give the protectionists credit for their entirely unselfish spirit, and for good, soft hearts. The speeches at the Cooper Union meeting were fairly overflowing with tender solicitude for the comfort of the working classes. "It is not for the purpose of making any manufacturer rich," says the benevolent protectionist; "that we impose high duties upon imports. It is not for the purpose of putting dollars into the pockets of the stockholders in woollen mills or in Bessemer-steel works and a multitude of other establishments, that we make the whole people pay taxes to them by obliging them to pay higher prices for the articles they have to buy. It is not the benefit of the capitalist that we have in mind at all. It is only of the poor laboring man that we think, and it is in his behalf that we tax the American people. If we did not tax them, the industries in which the laboring man is employed would go to the bottom; the laboring man would have nothing to do, and would perish in misery."

Listening to such speeches, one would think that if, in consequence of the high prices for manufactured articles which the tax imposed upon the purchasing consumer in the shape of tariff duties creates, the manufacturer "incidentally" gets rich, this philanthropic system would provide for some method to increase the benefit to the workingman, in the shape of wages, or a share in the profits in proportion to the profits of the whole business, or at least a method to secure the poor workingman—during times of prosperity, when the industry protected by a tax levy in the shape of protective duties yields large profits—against the distress of evil days, when, in consequence of the results of overstimulation, the industry breaks down and the laboring man is thrown out of work. This, however, does not seem to be the case. It is notorious that a good many manufacturers have at times made enormous profits and grown very rich, and that stockholders in some instances have received dividends amounting to from twenty to ninety per cent. on their investments. But we do not remember to have heard of a single case in which individual manufacturers or companies said to their operatives, "We have, owing to the tax levied upon your fellow-citizens for your benefit, done uncommonly well this year. The time may come when we may not do so well. We will therefore so apportion these unusual profits, which

we owe to that beneficent tax, among the company and you, the operatives, that you may have a comfortable reserve to live on if evil days should overtake us." This, we are sorry to say, has not been the way in which individual manufacturers or corporations talked to their workingmen about the profits derived from the high prices which resulted from the tax upon the consumers, levied, as they say, for the benefit of the poor laboring man. No, the poor laboring man received only those wages which the manufacturer was obliged to pay him according to the current price in the labor market: he received no more. And when the evil day comes—when a great establishment like the Union Iron and Steel Company in Chicago breaks down—then we are coolly informed that some thousands of workingmen are simply turned into the street. It appears, therefore, that, although the speakers at the Cooper Institute meeting may have meant what they said, the protective tariff is not as purely a philanthropic contrivance, and not as exclusive a benefit to the workingman, as they chose to represent it.

There is another fact which makes the philanthropic argument appear rather puerile. Hearing the protectionist orators speak, one would think that men obliged to work with their hands were naturally in a state of starvation in this country, and that it required a protective tariff to give them work and bread. The mere statement of the case suffices to show how absurd it is. There never has been a country under the sun whose natural resources invite and encourage and reward labor as do ours, and in which an artificial stimulus is so little needed to make labor of all kinds remunerative, and everybody who is able and willing to work comfortable. Would anybody undertake to assert that laboring men could not find ample work to do, or that they could not make enough by it for a comfortable livelihood, in times when this country had no protective tariff? When men were thrown out of work and went for some time without any, it was only because they had been devoting themselves exclusively to some specific employment which temporarily became unprofitable. And such things happened under a protective tariff as much as when we had none, and perhaps more so. But to say that a protective tariff is necessary to give the laboring men in America work and bread, is absurd.

EDUCATING WOMEN.

THE petition presented to the Trustees of Columbia College on Monday, on behalf of the education of women, was referred to a committee, which will, we suppose, report some plan of acceding to the petitioners' request. As has been repeatedly pointed out, the object of the movement is not to secure "co-education," but, as President Barnard expressed it, to secure for women the same general opportunities for education that are open to the men. As to details, the petitioners prefer to leave them entirely to the college. If the college objects to classes of young men and women receiving instruction together in the same rooms, then it is asked to provide for them separate instruction, as the Harvard "Annex" system does now. One method or the other is in

operation at two of the English universities and at a large number of the leading American colleges. The question which is presented to the Trustees is really whether it will confine the instruction it affords to one sex, or whether it will give equal opportunities to both.

It is expected that action on the petition will be taken at the next regular meeting, and the subject is so important that we trust it will then be fully discussed. It is a matter in which men are interested quite as much as women, and we have no doubt that most of the arguments against the higher education of women would, if they were fairly examined in debate, be found to rest on mere prejudice. The feeling against it, unless we are much mistaken, exists now chiefly among women themselves, and grows out of a confusion or fallacy with regard to a supposed effect on the manners and demeanor of the sex. If you ask a "conservative" woman what objection she has to her daughter getting the best education the times afford, you generally find she has in her mind a picture of a type of woman as produced by "higher education" not agreeable to the fancy of either sex—a woman who is undomestic in her habits and unfeminine in her tastes, who takes the initiative in conversation, is perpetually agitating for some "cause," or "reform," is ill-dressed and untidy, in fact regards dress as an unimportant matter, and the desire to attract the attention and interest of men as "frivolous." To make the picture more hideous, she is generally thought of as wearing spectacles and carrying an umbrella, and as having a family of neglected children and a miserably uncomfortable husband at home.

If there be a type in society of which this picture is a caricature, as is very possible, it is agitation, not education, that has produced it. The agitation for women's rights of one kind and another has been caused by the denial of these rights, and the work of bringing about a change has at least produced, as it generally does, reformers whose behavior is distasteful to conservatives, and who run into excesses which do something to bring reform into ridicule and contempt. But to educate a woman will not tend to make her an agitator of this sort, but, on the contrary, will probably have just the opposite effect. Why should training the mind of a woman, and throwing open to her the treasures of learning, make her a disagreeable companion, and lead her to insist on taking the stump and haranguing mixed audiences whenever she has an opportunity? Agitation as a career has and will always have few attractions for any but a small percentage of either sex, and we know that in the male sex the effect of the higher education is mainly conservative. The male type that corresponds with the female type at which conservative women shudder, is generally the product of ignorance rather than education; and we have no doubt that a thorough education, just "such as the men get," would have the effect of making fewer and fewer women set up with visionary schemes for the redemption of the world by the extension of "rights" of one kind and another.

The chief difficulty with the education of woman at present is not that she is educated too much, but that she is educated imperfectly. After being provided with one or two half-learned modern languages and a smattering of music or art, she is reported to her parents as "finished," and launched into the world. This is the old story, told, not by reformers, but by conservative satirists, a thousand times. So far from being educated, in nine cases out of ten she does not even know what education means. Of training and discipline she has little or none. One of the great advantages of opening the doors of colleges to her must be that she will be subjected to the same mental training and discipline that the experience of ages shows is the price of all intellectual improvement in either sex. Looking at the matter from a purely conservative point of view, we can imagine nothing more likely to promote intellectual modesty and diffidence among women, nothing less likely to encourage them to "unsex" themselves or to try to get up "movements" to regenerate the world, or to render a crusade against Man, in ready-made clothes, armed with the traditional umbrella and spectacles, attractive to them than a liberal education, such as a college of the standing of Columbia would provide.

The conservative ideal of women is a very old and valuable one, and has produced in times past female characters and lives of extraordinary beauty. It embraces all the gentler virtues and graces of mind and disposition, and it requires that woman should be, above all, charming—should always please. There is something almost grotesque in the notion that this ideal will be interfered with by the "higher education." A girl who has passed an examination and got a college degree does differ from a girl who has got a "diploma" from a finishing school (everybody knows, by the way, what a charmingly "domestic" place a girl's boarding-school is), chiefly in the fact of having got a diploma that is good for something. We know of no branch of human knowledge taught at Columbia or any other college which contains any principles calculated to lead women to believe that an undomestic life is best adapted to them. They will not find a hint of the kind in the classics, or mathematics, or science, or literature, or history. On the contrary, the broader a view women or men get of life—in other words, the more complete or "high" their education is—the more clear does it become that the ordinary career of woman must be that of a wife and mother.

It is this fact which makes conservatives so fond of dwelling on the importance of women being "charming." Being charming means principally, or at any rate three-quarters of the time, being charming to men. But the idea that ignorance constitutes with most men a large part of woman's permanent charm, is a delusion. An educated man may not like his wife or sister to display more knowledge than himself; but every man likes intellectual sympathy, and, consequently, on the theory that woman's first duty is to be charming, conservatives ought to admit that she should be afforded the best means of qualify-

ing herself for the task. To provide the higher education for one sex, and to cut the other off from it, is really unfair, on the conservative theory; it gives men a very high standard as to what women might know or appreciate intellectually, while it gives women no chance to conform to it. We are being told all the time that marriages are growing later because men are getting more and more exacting.

The common liberal arguments that women are entitled to the "higher education" for the same reason that they are entitled to manage their own property, to make their own contracts, to practise medicine, we should not, of course, dream of urging on conservatives; but we can assure them that, on their own ground, nothing ought to give them greater satisfaction than the manifestation by women of an interest in the higher education. The true corrective for the half-education that produces the type of woman that conservatives dread, is the education which disciplines the mind and teaches the use of the intellectual faculties. This the colleges alone can give, and give, moreover, to the large class of young women whose circumstances do not permit them to obtain at home anything like the thorough teaching of the university.

THE ENGLISH AND AMERICAN PRESS.

LONDON, January 12, 1883.

CERTAIN of the English newspapers, not long since, made much of an article in an American review decrying American journalism. I am the last to assert that there was not much justice in the article, but such matters are, after all, entirely comparative. It is well and wise for an American publicist to criticise with all useful or justifiable severity the weak or dishonest manner in which most American journalism is carried on; but an English journalist, in taking up the outcry, should be sure of his right, from his English standpoint, to throw stones at our glass house. No two men will see the matter from the same side, but it may, perhaps, be permitted one who has served in his day on both sides of the Atlantic, and whose knowledge of both systems runs beyond the day of nearly every actual editor of a leading journal on either side, to make a comparison which no man, possibly, is entirely qualified to make otherwise than suggestively, and pass judgment on the claims of English journalism to greater consideration than its American sister enjoys.

The *Pull Mall Gazette* may be allowed greater freedom of criticism in this matter—and has taken it—than any of its English contemporaries, because the sterling honesty of its general management and the superior ability of its editor-in-chief make it, for the day that is, the best newspaper in London. It has always been able, and, even under Greenwood, was the most remarkable in many ways of all European journals; but Greenwood's pungency was greater than his judgment—he was rancorous, and lost in personal bitterness the fairness of judgment which is indispensable to a strong lead in public opinion. But Morley is as able and can be as pungent as was ever Greenwood, and, though it seems to me that in some of his ideas of national policy he goes dangerously near to a relaxation of authority in favor of a local liberty which, however just theoretically, would be dangerous to England's actual imperial position, he is still, of the whole editorial corps, the man of the

largest, most generous, and liberal ideas. Admitting this, and that my *tu quoque* applies less to the journal which has most vigorously applauded the American critic of American newspapers, there is still a pebble or two in our garden-walks for the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and some larger for most of its English contemporaries.

It is unquestionably true that the level of American journalism is, so far as the results of education, even of abstract intellectual calibre, are concerned, much below that of England; and the sweeping assertion of the *Pall Mall*, in comment on the American writer—that no American journal approaches the English standard in the conduct of the proprieties of journalism—though exaggerated, need not form subject of dispute, for the exceptions which we might make would only show the rule more just. It is evident that the comparatively large number of Englishmen, graduates of the great universities, possessors of small or large incomes, who are ambitious of public lives, and hence willing to serve in journalism without regard to the rate of compensation—to say nothing of the relatively much greater number of Englishmen who have all the intellectual advantages which an university education can give—will, as long as such a disparity exists, give English journals an immense advantage in available intellectual resources, and a consequently higher average of staff ability. In the amenities of journalism, again, it is evident that, owing to the general higher social cultivation of the brain-workers in England, there will be a great difference in the standard to which the tone and conduct of a journal will be referred; and we must admit that many things are said in many American journals which no English journal read by the classes that control the tone of journalism would admit. In scholarship, and breeding, and intellectual and social training, England has the advantage over us by the result of the centuries of her universities and great fortunes. Against such advantages no young country can struggle.

But granting these disparities, I deny any further superiority to English journalism. In political honesty, in fairness as between man and man, I can only except the *Pall Mall Gazette*, under its present management, from the general rule, that the English journals are inferior to ours; in reckless partisanship they, with very few exceptions, certainly do surpass all our leading journals; in their subserviency to personal ends and interests—such as, for instance, the owning of the *World* by Jay Gould—they are quite as bad, if the personalities which control the tone of the paper are sometimes more respectable. Even the *Times*, which used to be the organ of public opinion, is becoming that of Mr. Walter just as much as the *Herald* is that of Mr. Bennett. And that form of dishonesty which is involved in the sacrifice of a common public interest to a class, clique, or vested interest is so general and so rank with the great English prints, daily or weekly, that it is neither reprehended nor apprehended by the public, while fair play as to persons, personal or national interests, ideas or doctrines which encounter common prejudices, is scarcely known to the most liberal English journals. Fair play is a virtue Englishmen are very fond of talking about, but which, except as between parties equally indifferent to English interests and prejudices, is very little known. I have lived in England since the more than Chinese wall of prejudice against foreigners was breached by the Crimean War, and see with satisfaction a great change in English ideas with reference to "outlandish" people; but at this day the broad hospitality of American journalism to the outsider, and its general fairness of appreciation of

foreign matters, is so imperfectly comprehended by the English press that they take it for our satisfaction at being noticed by foreigners (especially Englishmen), or the desire to conciliate them.

Now, as cleanliness does come after godliness though it is next to it, so good manners in the press do come after justice; and the English press, with all its ability and decorum, is as inferior to the American in the major virtue as ours to that in the minor virtues of decorum and scholarship. If American journals defend corrupt practices, English journals hide and ignore them, and the magnitude and venerable character of the abuses in nowise change the character of the defence. *Truth* is the only conspicuous print in England that does attack certain abuses which have no kind of parallel in America for journals to attack or defend, and *Truth* is an acknowledged corsair. It is true that no English journal now would defend such a corrupt system as our civil service, as certain American journals do, but the vice of English journalism is simply more decorous—it ignores.

But it is in criticism, literary and artistic, that the utter recklessness and want of conscience of the English press are most markedly shown. Art criticism is simply so preposterous that nothing need be said of it: from the *Times* to the *Saturday Review*, the notices of the plastic arts are beneath attention. In literature, the general tone is what might be expected from a society divided between mutual admiration and mutual detestation. I remember asking one of the most celebrated authors of the generation, some years ago, if he had read the criticisms on a certain volume just out, and he replied: "I never read the criticisms in the English journals; they are simply the expression of personal likes and dislikes; there is no longer any true criticism in England." Oddly enough, I had by chance known the way in which public opinion had been prepared for the work in question, which was as follows: When the first sheets were out of the press, a copy of the book (without waiting for the binding) was sent to personal friends of the author connected with the leading literary and daily papers, and a chorus of laudation was prepared so loud and so completely in accord that when it struck up, at the moment of the appearance of the book, the public ear was taken by storm, and no contrary voice dared raise itself for a long time, and until the book had reached its second edition. You have only to know to what clique an author belongs to be sure of the tone this or that paper will assume in criticising it. Even the *Times*—which, as a general thing, gives to the specialists which it has on its staff for most branches of criticism the books it considers worthy of notice—used, at the time when I was more conversant with these matters than I now am, to exclude rigorously certain authors from notice in its columns. I remember hearing a late eminent historian say that as long as — was at the head of the literary staff of the *Times* he had never a chance of being noticed in it; and, as the *Times* rarely expresses any very decided opinions in its criticisms, its preferable form of condemnation was silence. We who are, or have been, more or less behind the veil conceive no kind of respect for the literary criticisms of the English press. We know that the *Saturday Review* will always be caustic, and the *Times* always heavy and non-committal; but the authors and the critics, when not the same class, are too much interconnected to permit criticism to be fair and impersonal. The public is a stupid one: it goes to the Royal Academy year after year with no other desire than to be told what it shall admire, and admires it. Its intelligence is equal to the sensational

novel on which it largely feeds, and for everything beyond that it is willing to take on faith what is printed for it daily. The press is beset by young men, just from the universities, who for the most part know how to write excellent English, often able and witty, with the confidence in their own opinions which young men generally have before they have learned very much. They enjoy slashing their enemies and exalting their friends. The older ones were like them, and have grown up in the belief that criticism is a matter of opinion merely—*de gustibus non disputandum*—and they go on as they began; and so it happens that the body of the literary criticism is, and deserves to be, the most ephemeral of English literature—there is little knowledge and almost no conscience in it. If the *Spectator* is honest, it is heavy, and not always wise; and if the *Saturday Review* is bright, it is utterly dishonest, and so on; the *Pall Mall Gazette* and its seceding the *St. James's Gazette*—when the latter is not cantankerous, as it often is—leading the way in such exception as there is.

American journalistic literature has its grave faults, but, to my way of thinking, they are not so gross as those of the English. The honest, studied, deliberate opinion of the results of intellectual labor is rarer in English journalism than gentlemanly tone and scholarly brilliancy are in American; and in this comparison the press of London is losing, and perhaps the American, as a whole, is gaining.

THE PROSPECTS OF THE OPPOSITION.

LONDON, January 11, 1883.

It is significant of the tendency to do everything in public which our great-grandfathers would have done in private, that our political parties now discuss their own affairs, their organization, their leaders, their mistakes in the past, their weakness in the present, their plans for the future, in the columns of monthly magazines. Formerly, a party was guided by its acknowledged leader and the select council of experienced politicians who surrounded him. Discontented subordinates plotted against him, but they plotted in secret. They did not, unless when some open revolt broke out, go before the public with their complaints and schemes. We have changed all this. Party discipline has generally been lax among the Liberals, so that no one was much surprised when, under Lord Beaconsfield's Government, different lights of the Liberal party used to controvert one another in the press. But the Conservatives have had a closer party cohesion, and have been much less prone to rush into print. It is the more significant, therefore, when six Conservative members are found in three successive months using the pages of the *Fortnightly Review* and the *Nineteenth Century* to discuss the causes which have brought the Conservative Opposition to its present condition of mutual distrust and collective weakness. Some of these articles have been anonymous, but the writers are pretty well known, and the views they state, the complaints they level against their leaders, are repeated in speeches and conversation by men of mark in the Conservative ranks. There is something remarkable not only in discontent so openly expressed, but in the extreme disheartenment of a party lately so powerful. Though the Conservatives were beaten badly at the general election of 1880, they had been almost as badly beaten in 1868, yet within six years they came triumphantly into power. They have no such great occasion for despondency, particularly as Mr. Gladstone, who is the chief source of Liberal ascendancy—because the country believes in him, and he unites the different sections of his

party—may probably retire in a year or two's time. When he has retired, it will be far more difficult to hold together and manage the Ministerial party; so the Conservatives will then have a chance. However, this prospect does not console them. They recall with sadness the days when Lord Beaconsfield led a strong and submissive majority, and exhaust themselves in investigating the causes of their present misfortunes. Though they throw most of the blame on their own leaders, there are really other reasons not less important.

The first and chief of these is the dominion which Mr. Gladstone possesses over the popular mind. The Conservatives have not—it is not to be expected that they should have—any one to put in competition with him. Any Liberal candidate can conjure with his name, whereas there is for the moment no Tory name to conjure with—none which excites enthusiasm and lends authority to the doctrine or the name on whose behalf it is invoked.

The second is the absence of any positive and definite policy to set before the country. No doubt the chief business of a Conservative party is to maintain and justify existing institutions, and therefore a programme of legislative changes is less to be expected from them than from their opponents. Still, even in protecting and justifying what exists, there must be certain general principles capable of being stated, and there are measures which may be, and ought to be, passed in the interest of the whole people—measures which involve no disturbance of the political equilibrium. Such principles, such measures, Conservative statesmen ought to indicate; that they are not doing so, that the party has no constructive programme to place before the country, is the complaint made by some of the writers I have referred to, and one may therefore assume that this defect does not exist merely in the imagination of those who look at Conservatism from the outside. These writers blame the present leaders. But may not the fault be traced further back? It has been the fashion ever since Lord Beaconsfield's death to treat him as a man of profound insight and skill. He has become a beatified, if not canonized, saint to the Tory party, who are often heard to wish they had such a leader now. Nevertheless, it was really he who taught the Tory party to get on without constructive ideas. He had his views as regards foreign policy, and, whether constructive or not in that department, they were positive, and had much attraction for some minds. He relied a good deal on them, and believed, till the election of 1880 arrived, that they had won for him the support and confidence of the nation. But he had never any domestic legislation to propose which interested the people, or any considerable section of the people. He did not care for such matters, thought them below the level of the "haute politique" which he enjoyed, did not even train his lieutenants to consider this as an indispensable part of an English statesman's work.

He did, it is true, conceal the absence from his scheme of politics of constructive ideas, intended either to improve the machinery of government or to better, through wiser laws, the condition of the humbler classes, by the sonorous and often half mystical phrases which he scattered abroad, and which, while they taught little, seemed to suggest much. Hence the gap was not so much felt in his reign as it is now, when there is no similar master of language to give the *mot d'ordre* to Conservative speakers. They cannot hark back to his foreign policy, because that was condemned in 1880, and upon the other burning questions of the day they have, or seem to have, nothing specific to propose. While blaming the conduct of Irish

affairs by the present Government—and it is no doubt open to much criticism—they have not suggested any alternative policy. Some of the bolder spirits have, indeed, declared that nothing but repression was wanted—that the grievances of the Irish tenants are only the result of the weakness and lenity of Mr. Gladstone. The more responsible leaders do not deny that something was wrong, but have not indicated what remedial measures ought to have been taken, otherwise than by repeating that Mr. Gladstone's have been mischievous. As regards Egypt, it has been the same thing. The Government were blamed for not interfering sooner, and told that the National party was all moonshine. They were blamed for interfering in the way and at the time they chose; and when Arabi was tried, some prominent members of the Opposition pressed the Foreign Office with questions in a way which implied sympathy with Arabi, and almost went the length of espousing his cause. Such behavior gave the impression that these critics had really no view of their own, but were only casting about for some way of annoying the Government, determined to prove it wrong whether it held back in Egypt or went energetically forward. Consequently the Government was not damaged.

This mistake was made, not by the leaders of the Tory party, but by some of the younger and more eager partisans. But here we come upon the third and most serious of the evils which afflict the party. Its recognized leaders have not sufficient authority to hold their followers in check. They are flouted in Parliament and censured in magazines by those who ought to be their loyal subalterns. They are charged with want of courage, want of strategy, want of earnestness. It is alleged that they have fallen behind the time, while their jealousy of new merit makes them unwilling to bring on and give a chance to the rising young men. In fact, all the misfortunes of the party are laid at their doors. These sweeping accusations are unjust, because they do not allow for the exceptional difficulties which Sir Stafford Northcote has to encounter. His party has suffered during the last two sessions from bad generalship; but the fault has lain as much with the army as with the general. Himself a ready and effective, though not impassioned, debater, he is ill-supported in the House of Commons. Nearly all the best speakers of the Tory party are in the House of Lords, where they are not wanted, because they have there an overwhelming majority. In the Lower House there is very little debating power among the Conservatives, and a good deal on the Government side. Hence Sir Stafford Northcote feels that there is not much use in fighting pitched battles, since he is sure to be beaten, not only in numbers, but in argument. His own preference is for a quiet and watchful opposition, which may every now and then embarrass the Government and point out their mistakes to the country, but which should seldom challenge a formal trial of strength. He sees no great good to be attained by constant skirmishing, judging (and judging wisely) that the Ministerialist majority is more likely to be distracted by internal dissensions if it is not kept always on the *qui vive* to resist attacks from without. This, however, is not the view of the active youth of the Tory party. They are always ready for a fray, and have persuaded themselves that the secret of Lord Beaconsfield's success lay in his powers of invective. They are therefore perpetually taking, or making, occasions for a raid upon the Ministry; and Mr. Gladstone's readiness to lift up every glove that is thrown down, and the warmth with which he repels attacks made on his own motives, add zest to the process. They get plenty of practice in speaking, and

succeed in delaying the Government measures, but otherwise nothing is gained for their party. The country is disgusted, and the Ministerialists, irritated by this idle skirmishing, close their ranks and give a more unquestioning support to Mr. Gladstone than he might otherwise obtain. Sir Stafford Northcote and his brother chiefs sometimes try to call in and hold back these skirmishers, but usually in vain. They think his quietness want of spirit, then refuse to obey, and sometimes draw him on into conflicts which his judgment seems to disapprove. Thus the discipline of the party suffers, and the strength of the party, the moral weight which its protests might have if reserved for important occasions, is frittered away on these trifling engagements. A party leader has with us no means of controlling the members of his party except by the ascendancy of his own character, for a constituency will not generally punish its member by throwing him over unless he has openly voted against the principles he was returned to support. This spirit of mutiny or independence, whichever one calls it, is therefore a great difficulty in his conduct of affairs, and the failures of the party may fairly be ascribed as much to its existence as to any mistakes in its strategy.

If it is asked what produces this disorderly spirit, the answer must be: impatience, and an exaggerated idea of the importance of House of Commons struggles. There are many people in the world who mistake restlessness for energy, and fancy that the way to succeed is to be always doing something. For themselves, these skirmishing politicians may be right, since they at any rate bring their names before the public, but they do no good to their party. Very often a cause has more to gain from the mistakes of its adversaries, and from the languor which sooner or later comes upon them, than from any advocacy of its own claims. There are several ways of working up a minority into a majority, but constant carping is not one of them. However, as the Liberals were constantly active in their campaigns against Lord Beaconsfield, and used pretty strong language about him and his Government, the young Conservatives think that what answered for their opponents must answer for them also. They forget that the agitation of the Liberals was chiefly an agitation in the country, with comparatively little fighting in the House of Commons. This is the second mistake the Tories have been making. They greatly overrate the influence of House of Commons debates on the country. These debates are now far less fully reported than formerly, partly because they are so inordinately long, partly because the London newspapers are printed off earlier in the morning, in order to catch the earliest trains. It is only on great occasions that speeches made in Parliament are attentively studied, even by that part of the nation which cares about politics. Those who are themselves members of the House of Commons are naturally interested by the tournaments which go on there under their own eyes, and attribute too much importance to them. The causes which move public opinion and determine the result of an appeal to the nation are large causes, and operate with little reference to the prowess shown in such tournaments. If the Conservative debaters were to strike harder home at the Government when it gets into a difficulty, that might put the party into better heart for the time, but it would make little difference in the long run. And now the weakness of the party in the House of Commons is of less evil augury than these despondent Tory writers fancy. Their turn will come, if only they have patience.

What injures them in the opinion of moderate men now is not so much their want of fighting power as their want of judgment, calmness, and

resolution, and, still more, their want of a positive and constructive policy. It is not brilliant debaters whom the English care to see at the head of a Conservative Ministry, but solid, steady men, with administrative capacity and a disposition to prevent the necessity for large changes by a willingness to make small ones in a cautious way. If the Conservative party could get hold of one or two such men—men of the type of Sir Robert Peel, even if less eminent—they might look forward to a return to power at no distant day. Firmly as the Liberal Government seems to stand now, no one can tell how its sections may feel toward one another after Mr. Gladstone's sceptre has passed to other hands. There may be dissensions and a break-up of the parliamentary majority. There may be a lukewarmness on the part of some important class, as there was among the Nonconformists in 1874. The forces which make for Conservatism are always so strong in England that Liberalism succeeds only when the Liberal party is excited, stimulated either by devotion to some particular man, or by the prospect of some much-desired reform. If a general election takes place at a dull time, and upon no important issue of principle, it is apt to result in favor of the party which has property upon its side. A quiet policy, a waiting policy, is, therefore, the true one for the Conservatives to follow at present; for it will not delay, and may hasten, that natural reaction in which their best chance lies. Unfortunately for them, this is just what the eager youth cannot reconcile themselves to. They seem disposed to repeat next session the mistakes of the last two.

Y.

THE RESTORATION OF ST. MARK'S.

VENICE, December 11, 1882.

IN my former letter there was question of the high tide of the 28th of October as of a very unusual event. And so, indeed, it seemed, as none such had occurred since 1876, and none before that since 1866—to take the dates given by shopkeepers on the Piazza. But yesterday it came again. In October there was full moon, this time there was "no moon"; there was *scirocco* (southeast wind), of course, as that is a condition precedent, blowing up the tide from the ocean and filling the channels of the Lagoon. And as yesterday was Sunday, as it was very warm (50° Fahrenheit), and not raining, the occasion served as a feast not laid down in the calendar, and the Piazza, in the morning, was crowded with boats. Perhaps one hundred and fifty small craft—gondolas, barchettas, sandolos, and canoes—were swarming theretogether; some had come in through the Merceria and the other little streets behind the Piazza, but the greater number came from the harbor, over the edge of the Molo. For two hours there was a scene of unusual gayety, shouts and cries, the upsetting of canoes, the transportation of foot-passengers from dry land on one side to dry land on the other, in boats or on backs; and the alarm arose that the water was falling, and there was a huddle and a rush to escape through the narrow space left open in the temporary wooden bridge along the quay.

If boats have been to day where they are not wont to go, they have also been cut off from their usual routes. The gondolas from the railway station have had to follow the circuitous course of the Grand Canal, as their usual more direct course by the smaller water streets was shut by the water rising too high under the bridges. And the steamboats on the Grand Canal could not run, because there was not height enough under the iron bridge at the Academy of Fine Arts; so that for once the

twin modern abominations of Venice had quarrelled. Could they but have wrought their own mutual destruction!

Not that they are equally obnoxious to the lover of Venice. Nothing is to be said for the iron bridge: it is a monster, an eyesore, an offence in every way, and does no service to any one beyond accommodating a very few foot-passengers, at two centesimi apiece, who might have crossed in a gondola for five. As for the steamboats, it is just a year—All Saints' Day, 1881—since they began their trips, and a few months before that time a friend of yours landed at Liverpool and hurried through to Venice that he might see it again before the boats should be there to spoil it. His fears were natural; no one who knew and loved Venice could have been without such anxieties. But we have the pleasure of reporting that the result is not so bad as was to be expected. Such innocent little boats were never seen before. They are not twice as long as a gondola; they are very silent—they puff not nor ring bells, and but seldom whistle. One man, seated at the wheel amidsthips, says gently to the engineer below, "Avanti," "Dietro," "Ferma"; another man gathers the two-soldi pieces, or palancas, which constitute the fare; and he, if in Paris, would have a dreadful horn to blow as the boat approaches a station, but here he is hushed to the prevalent tranquillity. The canal is really none the worse for these boats, except as they disturb its drowsy sentiment of antiquity. Nor do they govern Venice as surface and elevated railways are supposed to govern New York. After dark they are not allowed to run, as the canal is not lighted in any way; they are stopped when there is a fog; and on the feast of the Madonna della Salute, in November, they had to put up with the usual two bridges of boats across the Grand Canal, and to interrupt their trips accordingly. The barcaioli may find their monopoly infringed and their business injured, until the natural adjustment comes with time, but they don't mind the steamboats at all—perettas, barchettas, batellas, caorlinas, burechis, and steamboats accommodate one another in the friendliest way; nor is the traveller in his gondola at all conscious of being bullied by the larger and swifter vessels.

But to come back to the flood in St. Mark's Place. It is perhaps to be wished that the columns of St. Mark's Church should rise out of the water always. Never did they look more lovely than with the little salt waves lapping against their bases. And the writer, for one, has never been able to forgive the Piazza for being so large and showy, so well paved, so uniformly walled in with palace fronts. One longs for the old time when a little canal crossed from south to north, close to the walls of St. Mark's Church; when another canal, parallel to the former, bounded the open square on the west, and that at half its present length; when all the south side was built up with private houses, as shown in Gentile Bellini's picture; and when the early Church of Saint Geminiano stood where now is the very centre of the Piazza, and on the edge of the second canal, so that the tranquil little place was no more than a *campo*, like many another in Venice, with nothing to give it especial glory beyond its fellows, except the lovely church on its eastern side. In what has just been said there may be a slight mingling of dates and epochs—no matter for that; the point is, that the square is a great deal too big and too showy for the church to have its best effect, and that it would be better if the church could never be seen at a greater distance than fifty yards.

For there is nothing about the church which appeals to the distant spectator. It is small, it is square, it is low; beyond all other buildings,

it is lovely in external color and in variety and delicacy of sculptured detail. But these are addressed to the student who strolls beneath its morning shadow, or studies its mosaics in the light of evening sunshine. It is not a Gothic cathedral, to rise above a subject town and call across the fields to distant villages; it is built under the protection of a palace larger and higher than itself, of which it was the chapel. The great tower that belongs to it, and that holds its bells, is separated from the church by a public place as wide as Broadway. That, indeed, is seen from afar, and over broad stretches of sea; but of the church only the iron finials and weather-cocks are visible above the palace roofs to distant gazers. And the great tower is without detail, as if meant to attract no eyes but those of distant navigators of the lagoon, while the church is absolutely encrusted with gold and color and delicate carving in low relief, inside and out, walls, roof, and floor—a bewildering museum of precious art, and the loveliest piece of decoration in color that Europe holds.

It is upon this assemblage and combination of delicate art and workmanship that the restorers have been employed for many years, with but brief interruptions. Under the Austrian rule, from 1850 to about 1858 (it is difficult to establish the exact dates, but they are not important), the work of rebuilding the north face went on. Then came a pause. The floor and the mosaics within attracted the attention of the restorers, but not much was done at any one time until after the expulsion of the Austrians. Since Italy has begun to "do for herself," the work of renewing the south side has been undertaken and carried out, and now scaffoldings are up on the west front, with mats of reed and osier which hide what is being done behind them. To describe the results of these restorations is to deal with changes wholly unwarranted, and destruction the most wanton and inexcusable. It is apparent that the present directors are wiser and more careful, and that, so long as the present control shall exist, wanton recklessness and causeless destruction will be avoided; but even up to a very recent epoch, five or six years ago at most, changes were made without cause, and parts of the old work, taken down perhaps of necessity, were put up again haphazard, or replaced indifferently by new material.

In speaking of St. Mark's, one may use the regular terms of orientation as in speaking of a French cathedral, for St. Mark's is approximately *orienté*—much more nearly so than is common in Italy. The apse is turned to the east; the great façade on the Piazza is then the west front; the side on the little square of the lions and toward the Merceria is the north flank; and the short elevation on the Piazzetta, and looking toward the sea, is the south flank. Now, the work done during the Austrian dominion (speaking of the exterior only) consisted in rebuilding and renewing the north flank, from the projection of the transept to the northwest angle. It was done with sufficient care to insure the retention of the main lines of the building, and, so far as one can now judge, to replace each column and capital, and each encrusted piece of carved marble in its proper position. Photographs taken by Mr. Ponti in the very first years of his practice, in 1850, as he now assures us, certainly before the scaffoldings were put up on the north side, afford the means of tolerably close comparison with the existing building. Every change of a capital, or even of a slab of the thin marble veneering which invests the whole building, is perfectly visible; and one thing appears evident, that the curious and beautiful little pavilion which projects from the northwest angle—not properly to be

called a porch, as it leads to no doorway, but flanks the façade as a purely ornamental feature—that this remains intact. The work on the south side was done much more recently, and finished only five years ago. The renewed part here extends from the inner angle made by the Treasury (which was spared) to the southwest corner of the church, and, most unfortunately, it includes the angle pavilion on this side, which has been wholly rebuilt. Of the two separate pieces of work, that on the south side, the latest one, seems to have been done with the least conscience. Even sections of mouldings have in one case at least been changed, as if the old work had been plucked down and carted off before anybody had thought to take a careful mould of its profiles.

But there is one point in which the destruction has been at once the greatest and the most wanton. The walls of the church are faced and entirely covered with thin slabs of marble. In the old work these were of extraordinary beauty—Greek and Oriental stones of strange veinings of purple and warm brown—and set so as to be the most effective, in small pieces, the veinings prettily contrasted and opposed in “herring-bone” patterns and zigzags, or more elaborately combined into rhomboids by opposing the reversed slabs cut out of one richly-veined block. The effect of color produced by this wonderful surface of warm tints, subdued and gilded by time, emphasized by the more brilliant hues of the few mosaics which line niches and the like, and contrasted by the soft gray shades of delicate bas-relief, is indescribable, and, so far as we know, unequalled in art. As the walls of the Treasury building and of most of the west front still are, so was the whole south flank and its corner pavilion when the writer was last in Venice, and so was the north flank, unquestionably, before 1850.

Nor should any one, thinking of the merely expensive and gorgeous, but never very effective, use of rich marbles in sixteenth-century door-pieces and seventeenth-century altars, in churches at Rome or at Florence, at Ghent or Bruges, for one moment think that all this Venetian splendor was, after all, not very valuable—only sheets of veined marble, mere curiosity and bric-à-brac, not architecture. Byzantine art was always strongest in pure decoration separated from the sterner and graver duties of the builder: color was to the whole twelfth century, in the East and in the West, what organized sculpture grew to be in the thirteenth—its favorite mode of expression. Both influences combined in the choice of the external adornment of St. Mark's, and the tribute of Greece and of the Levant to the powerful and dreaded Republic was embodied in the precious materials sent by the shipload to adorn the chapel of her dukes. The use of beautiful materials is therefore more free and extensive, and also immeasurably more artistical, than elsewhere. Small pieces of Byzantine enamelling are of priceless value, not to collectors only, but to the lover of color-harmonies; the whole church of St. Mark is like a great casket, where still richer and softer colors than those of enamel are combined on a great scale and with unequalled knowledge and skill.

What, then, have the restorers done to this exterior to justify this long preface? They have stripped the walls of their precious, ancient, richly-colored, and richly-veined stones, and have substituted a smooth and uniform sheathing of common and inexpensive bluish, gray-veined Italian marble, purchasable anywhere by the square metre. They have done this, not in one place or in two, but over great surfaces of wall. We count, now, on the south flank of the church and on the north, the places where the marble has been spared—not those where

new marble has been put in. The old marbles were fitted together in small pieces; here and there they had corners broken and pieced, or irregular cracks across their surface. The metal clamps and anchors that held them fast to the brickwork were rather easily seen by those who looked for them; weather-stains were plenty. Irregularity like that of a fine Eastern carpet, and not accurate balance; unexpectedness, and not regular repetition; glow and splendor, not colorless uniformity, were the motives of the old design. But to the modern engineer or architect, brought up and taught in the Italy of 1830 to 1860, to whom Palladio probably was a demigod, all this old work was unpleasing. He did not hate it as long as it passed for an antique, for a curiosity, for barbaric spoils of the past; but to reproduce it, to take pains to disturb it the least possible, and to put back religiously all he had to take down—a thing not to be asked of him. Down it came, to allow of the perhaps necessary strengthening of the brickwork behind it; much of it was broken in the hasty stripping off; much of it, as appears, was allowed to be appropriated and sold to this and that foreigner; the rest was sorted out, and the less-injured and more uniformly-marked pieces were brought together and used in certain recessed and withdrawn parts of the building. All the rest of the wall, including the outer and more prominent parts, spandrels and archivolt of the great vaults, large lower surfaces below the windows and bas-reliefs—all was faced with marble of no color and but little variety of veining, in slabs of uniform size, very accurately and neatly adjusted.

There remain, in the defaced north and south sides of the church, disks of some of the richest of the old marbles, an archivolt of the “Arabian Porch” on the north side, and many a good bit besides, cleaned off, to be sure, and deprived of its old soft color given by time. The old shafts of porphyry and verde antique, alabaster, and cipollino remain, and are all, or nearly all, in their old places, though they also have been washed up and rejuvenated. The square projection of the Treasury, next to the Porta della Carta and the Ducal Palace, remains intact; the northwest angle pavilion and the old front of the church are also intact, or very nearly so. Scaffoldings, indeed, are up now on the west front, but, as has been said above, the present direction seems to be better advised than those which have gone before. If much has been lost, much remains. But few of the lovely Byzantine capitals have been replaced by new ones, and those few were terrible wrecks. Even in the rebuilt southwest pavilion, the old shafts and the old capitals fill their old places. Nor has any hand been lifted up against the bas-reliefs of Grecian, Oriental, and Italian work, of which there are, though few on the south side, many elsewhere.

Now, as to the necessity of the rebuilding, and taking up the question with reference to the south flank and southwest corner only: it is asserted very positively that the whole of the masonry here threatened ruin. It has been very completely rebuilt. The wall here is that of the Zeno Chapel (Cappella Zen) and of the Baptistery. The mosaics of these two apartments, both walls and vaults, were torn down with pick-axes, and without attempt to preserve even parts of them. All the accounts agree as to this, and yet those were as precious mosaics as almost any in the building.

None of the numerous commentators upon these restorations have denied the haste and recklessness of the demolitions; but neither do any of them deny that rebuilding here was a necessity. It is plainly asserted that the angle pavilion was threatening to fall, and to drag down with itself the never very solid, and now

thousand-year old, brickwork of the neighboring walls—in partial proof of which photographs are shown of this part of the building as it was in 1867, exhibiting certainly a bewildering tangle of iron-ties and straps and suspension rods. Let us, then, admit that most extensive and thorough repairs were called for, and that they were rightly undertaken. It remains true that every part of the outside decoration could have been put up again exactly as it had always been. Nothing is easier than to make a great cartoon with every joint and every irregularity of surface marked upon it; to number each scrap or fragment of stone with stiff water-color and a brush; to lay every piece flat on a garret floor in its original relations to every other; to take off from the wall and to preserve every piece of mosaic; and, finally, to put all back in *statu quo ante*. Nothing, we say, is easier, except to do as the engineers did—that is, to let it all be torn down anyhow by contractors; to exercise no watchfulness over the smaller and less seemingly fragments; to leave it all to the fidelity to a common contract of common builders, and to the supervision of ordinary building superintendents. The capitals of the Ducal Palace, of which there was question in my former letter, are constructive features; if they are unsound, the building is unsafe. The marble and mosaic decoration of St. Mark's Church are not, in any sense, constructional. No injuries to these, no wear, no shabbiness, no slow decay, no gaps, no breaks, no cracks, can authorize interference with them. The old work, no matter how defaced and injured, is better than the best modernization of it. That, one would have said, was an established law in such cases.

R. STURGIS.

Correspondence.

MR. H. H. BANCROFT'S LITERARY METHODS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Is not your correspondent, Mr. Charles H. Phelps, in your issue of the 1st instant, less than just to Mr. H. H. Bancroft?

Perhaps Mr. Phelps is not aware that there are two Mr. Bancrofts in the publishing firm of A. L. Bancroft & Co., of San Francisco, and that it is Mr. A. L. Bancroft who may be seen “every business day at the head of the extensive and complicated business, signing checks, etc.” This Mr. Bancroft told the present writer, in London, last spring, that after his return to San Francisco in the summer his brother, Mr. H. H. Bancroft, would devote all of his time to his historical work.—I am, sir, etc.,

A. F. HUNTER.

Boston, Feb. 3, 1883.

A NEW FIELD FOR CONVICT LABOR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will you allow me to offer a suggestion on the subject of convict labor? It is this: Let all convicts who can read and write be set, under competent supervision, to *indexing books*; and let those who cannot, receive the necessary instruction as soon as may be.

It is almost an insult to your penetration to point out the advantages of this plan. I may mention, however—

That it will not conflict with the interests of any class of laboring persons, or at least any that has a claim to consideration;

That the kind of labor proposed is peculiarly suited to the reformatory idea, being incompatible for teaching order, patience, humility, and

for thoroughly eradicating the last trace of the Old Adam in whoever pursues it.—I am, sir, etc.,

ANOBIVM PERTINAX.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, Feb. 2, 1883.

THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In one of your editorials of last week, speaking of the protestation of innocence made by some men convicted of murder in Ireland, you alluded to a Catholic manual, entitled, 'What Every Christian Must Know and Do.' In the course of your remarks, you seemed to opine that the manual in question, bearing the approbation of Cardinal Cullen, would afford outlaws and criminals arguments to parade their innocence before the public. In proof thereof, you quoted a passage to the effect that, when absolution is given by the priest, "your sins are forgiven, the pains of hell taken away, and your soul made bright and beautiful like an angel of God, and the kingdom of heaven is yours."

The fair spirit, however, which uniformly characterizes the *Nation* redeemed itself when you requested some Catholic theologian to make an explanation on the subject. If no abler and better qualified person has already acted under your suggestion when this reaches you, I would ask the favor of submitting to your readers the following simple considerations:

By the sacrament of auricular confession the Catholic Church understands a conscientious self-accusation of sins committed, to a lawfully ordained priest. If the penitent is heartily sorry, fully determined never to repeat the crime, animated with a firm purpose of amendment, and possessed of other concomitant dispositions, absolution is granted unto him; but supposing that one of the sins confessed might have been a murder, the fact that he received sacramental absolution does not make him "innocent as the child unborn," either in the sight of God or of man. I speak of innocence in contradistinction to guilt deserving a human punishment. Christ on the cross told the penitent thief: "This day thou shalt be with me in paradise." He forgave him, but did not call him innocent, and say that he was suffering unjustly.

A sin, a crime, especially when injurious to a fellow-being, must be considered in a twofold light: first, as an offence to God, and as such deserving an eternal punishment in the future life; second, as a grievous human offence against society, and as such deserving a human retribution in this world. Now, sacramental absolution, granted and applied through the merits of Christ, remits the eternal punishment; but the temporal one consequent on the infringement of human laws cannot be washed away by the vicarious blood shed on Mount Calvary. The first is a matter of conscience, and with that human justice has nothing to do; for, according to the old Roman maxim, "De internis non judicat prætor."

Hence it becomes evident that when the priest, in virtue of a delegated power, grants pardon "in foro interno"—that is to say, in the court of conscience—the course and operations of human justice are not in the least affected, and the penitent, rising from his knees, is as guilty and accountable to society after as well as he was before going to confession.

Any man, Protestant or Catholic, has a right to plead "not guilty" before the sentence is pronounced from the judicial bench—"nemo se criminari tenetur." But if he happens to be a member of the Catholic Church, he cannot call himself innocent because a priest said, in the name of God, that his sin was forgiven him.

If a Catholic, then, should have the effrontery

to declare himself innocent of a murder he really committed, because the future punishment due to it was forgiven in the sacrament of penance, we may say of him with St. John, "that he lies, and the truth is not in him."

Yours truly,

A. T. ENNIS,

Pastor Catholic Church.

MANHATTAN, KANSAS, Jan. 26, 1883.

RELIGIOUS DISCIPLINE AT HARVARD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: A communication which appears in the *Nation*, whatever its native excellence, is thereby raised to a level which perforce makes criticism necessary. For fear that the letter in your last number, "Religious Discipline at Harvard," may not come to the eyes of men better informed on the subject than myself, as a past officer of the St. Paul's Society (of the Episcopal Church) of Harvard, caring for its reputation, I cannot let the charges in it pass unnoticed.

In the winter or spring of 1881, some \$8,000 or \$9,000 was offered to the Society with which to build a permanent chapel, provided a suitable building-plot could be found, and the Society should show that there were enough good, earnest churchmen in the University to keep up such a building, and warrant the expenditure of so great a sum—the good sense of which was apparent to all. As most of the land in the neighborhood is owned by the College, and the rest very closely held, it became necessary to petition the Faculty or Overseers for land on which to build. This petition was refused on the ground that the College could not recognize sectarianism, and the plan fell through.

In the meantime, to satisfy themselves of the number of churchmen, a canvass was made. How thorough this was I am unable to say, but feel sure it was done in good faith, and know that the results were not markedly different from the annual statistics taken by the Faculty and published in "The Harvard Book," triennial reports, etc. Upon so slight a foundation, "A Student," fretting under the irksome religious discipline (?) of Harvard, and with the petulance of a child who won't eat bread because its milk is sour, charges that these statistics "were taken with the express purpose of deceiving"; that "a zealous member, through one of the papers—an organ of his [the italics are mine]—attempted to show," etc.; that "the returns were falsified"; that "the list was drawn up for a purpose, and the designers did not scruple at any means to bring about the desired end." These statements have the raciness of a political controversy, are decidedly "brash," and, applied to men now out of college, are lacking in that courtesy which, by a longer sojourn in Cambridge, the writer may acquire. They are wholly inapplicable to the then officers and members of the Society active in this affair, who were known as a more than ordinarily "good set of fellows"—their social standing of the best. The one making them in an outside publication, no matter how thoughtlessly, merits a good round rebuke.

The reason of all this rancor is thus quietly summed up: "As a result, the public have the opinion that Harvard is more religious than she really is!"

This was written merely to correct gross misstatement, not with the intention of carrying on the old argument, nor as a Philistine warring on the chosen few of agnosticism. A few words, however, may not be out of place. It is questionable whether the prevalence of scepticism and unbelief, *pari passu* with increasing liberalism in the matter of chapel-going, is an argument for its total abolishment. The young student, still groaning under the burden of occa-

sional chapel-going and attendance at church (not a Senior), could have been at the time but a Sophomore—more probably a Freshman. As one who has had his bout in Spencerian philosophy, and been thrown with the agnostic tendencies of Harvard, I should like to record that a Freshman who knew at least a dozen agnostics in one class, and whose "acquaintance" was so limited as to escape the canvasser, is the precocious and wholly abnormal development, not of Harvard, but of those fortuitous circumstances that led him there. As a matter of fact, the young man who is "agnostic" for the sake of argument, when it comes to enrolment, in general stands out in the faith of his fathers; and hence the "dozen" easily and naturally become "three."

More than this, there is a strong undercurrent against voluntary prayers among the students. The matter came up for debate in the Harvard Union, I think, which contained more than a fair proportion of the free-thinking and Bohemian elements, and a large number of men came out decidedly opposed to the abolishment of prayers. Out of the rut, and rubbing with the world, their position seems to me correct; for, though the remark quoted from President Eliot's report may be one of the *President's blank forms*, it is yet true that this discipline is wholesome, even from a material point of view. The majority of people one meets have religious sentiment and are sensitive to it. It is well to have a sense of that sentiment ground into the young man. The youth who in the Cambridge garden is so hurt with the thorns as he plucks the roses of undergraduate life, will find it bitter pushing through the barriers and hedgerows that exist, outside the cultivated circle, in this everyday, working world. The present system of religious discipline at Harvard has no doubt its evil side. Is there a better? A practical test would show its results highly preferable to none at all.

A GRADUATE.

JANUARY 29, 1883.

SOUTHERN HOMICIDE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: We Southerners who think substantially with the *Nation* on this question can, I think, do our section some service by writing short articles to our papers, both secular and religious, presenting the question fairly and directly; and if the papers of our city or town have brought up the subject, we can insist on their discussing the question on its merits, and not allow them to evade the real issue, as so many are doing, by searching for the ulterior motives of the *Nation*. From my intercourse with Northern men, I find the *Nation* but expresses the common opinion of the North. This opinion was formed before the *Nation* came into existence. With Redfield's 'Homicide, North and South' (J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia) in our hands, we can get enough startling facts to jar the self-complacent and to produce some agitation. It is at least worth the effort.

VIRGINIAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: My subscription is nearly out. I enclose \$3 to renew. To some extent, renewal seems to have been made the test of your subscribers' opinions upon the question of homicidal ethics discussed in your columns; hence you will permit me to say I make this enclosure because I cannot spend the same amount in any way which, in a year, will give me the same intellectual enjoyment, or as much food for reflection. With some of your opinions I do not agree, but surely it is wise to hear the other side of any question, especially when as fairly put as

you generally have it. If you are to express only my opinions, it would be better for me to stop my subscription, save my money, and rely on my own thinking.

Most you say of Southern homicides is true, though I do not concur in all your conclusions. My not concurring, however, shall not make me fly off at a tangent and in a pet. I cannot forget your manly course in sustaining the great principles of civil and individual liberty during the dark days of reconstruction, when to do so was not popular in your section, and when our dearest rights were dependent on their maintenance. Nor do I complain that your criticisms on homicidal tendencies are confined to this section; it is always more agreeable to take the beam out of our brother's eye than the mote out of our own. Allow me, however, in conclusion, to suggest, more as a question of taste than in any spirit of unfriendly criticism, that perhaps your readers would be happier if you brought the homicidal discussion to an end. Northern people must sometimes tire of hearing of Southern sins, and we Southerners, like other sick people, become nauseated with too much medicine, though given with the kindest motives, and however much we may acknowledge the necessity of the original dose.

Very truly your friend,

CHAS. M. BLACKFORD.

LYNCHBURG, VA., Jan. 29, 1883.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Perhaps if all the Northern press were to discuss the question of "Southern Homicide" and "Why Capital does not Seek Investment in the South" in the judicial, conservative manner in which you have lately argued it, there would not be that sensitiveness on the part of Southern people to the publicity given to the matter which you see now manifested. But your way of treating the subject, unfortunately, is not the prevailing disposition of the Northern press. Namely, in the Christmas number of *Puck*, with the chimes of Peace and Good-Will echoing o'er the earth, there appears on its last page a colored picture aimed at the South, and calculated to do us lasting harm. The picture represents a swamp, with a big sign (sticking out of the mud and water) inviting Northern immigrants to come and settle; but as the immigrants come down the road headed by a fat capitalist with a bundle of greenbacks, and a sturdy workingman with his tools on his shoulder, they are halted by a ghastly figure—a stalwart skeleton, with knives and pistols in its belt, a rope around its neck, and carrying a shotgun—warning them to turn back in haste unless they would "die by violence." Behind this ghastly desperado who bars their path can be seen a fine rolling country, but on every hill-top a negro swinging from a tree, and in every field a lonely grave.

In his comments on this "cartoon," the editor says—without limiting his language to any one State, or to one part of the South, but embracing the entire country—that the capitalist who attempts to collect his just debts in the South must expect either to be lynched or assassinated for "doing his duty"—i.e., collecting his just debts. *Puck* has probably a large circulation in this country, and doubtless finds readers in England and on the Continent of Europe. The effect on the imagination of an ignorant foreigner of such a picture illustrating life in the South would be to arouse the most horrible conceptions and forebodings if he contemplated migrating there. How incalculable the injury it could do. It has been said you cannot indict a nation; ought there to be immunity for libelling an entire people, and accusing them, without

limit, of assassinating and lynching unoffending capitalists who are simply in the act of collecting their just dues? The world knows that society in the South is not in the disturbed condition it is at present in Ireland. Yet, in sober earnest, the editor of *Puck* accuses the Southern people of greater crimes against unoffending capitalists who come to their country to do them good, than have yet been charged against the Irish peasantry in the most disaffected districts.

A heart regardless of its social duties, and fatally bent on mischief, is one definition of malice. Malice is also inferred from want of probable cause. How, then, can the editor of *Puck* escape the charge of having wantonly and maliciously printed a libel against the Southern people, who have done him no wrong, but, by buying his paper, have contributed to his good? Your paper, Mr. Editor, has treated Southern questions in a very different manner from the heartless, false satire of *Puck*.

I have subscribed to the *Nation* for years; have had my heart delighted at some of your defences and kind words in encouragement of the South, and I thought at the time such a course must lose you subscribers with a certain class at the North. As I have followed you in your discussion of "Southern Homicide," I have thought it a pity that the South just at this time should be brought into such unpleasant notoriety. If one could induce some portion of the tide of immigration to flow to her, and some of the unemployed capital at the North to seek investment in her borders, he would do a better service to the South than by holding up to public scorn and ridicule a defect in her social system. But I see there are others who differ, and think that to secure the immigrants and capital we must first bring about a change in public sentiment as to the "sacredness of human life." How far the late war may be responsible for such a state of affairs, I cannot pretend to say; but it seems to me that after four years of fighting, in which every family lost some member, and the entire male population took part, and death by violence—i.e., in battle—was a daily occurrence, people would naturally grow somewhat obtuse on the subject of homicide; and during the years of the carpet-bag régime it became very general for the whites to carry arms for their own protection and that of others, in case of any unforeseen disturbance, *mêlée*, or quarrel between the whites and blacks, and among the whites themselves. But, whatever the cause, the habit of carrying concealed deadly weapons, and the disposition to resort to them in settlement of personal quarrels, are much to be deprecated; and where inveighed against in a manly, charitable way, let us hope the people of the South will find some return for the irritation the discussion has given rise to in an improved public sentiment on the subject.

Yours truly,

WM. H. S. BURGWIN.

HENDERSON, VANCE CO., N. C., Jan. 29, 1883.

Notes.

'THE War between Peru and Chile,' by Clements R. Markham, will bear the American imprint of R. Worthington. The same publisher has nearly ready a new edition of Mr. Theodore Tilton's novel, 'Tempest Tossed.'

The Century Co. will revise the revised 'Imperial Dictionary,' and give it the name of 'The Century Dictionary.' This task will occupy several years, and will be under the direction of Prof. W. D. Whitney.

Dr. E. H. Knight, whose death in Ohio was recently announced, had been engaged for some

time on a supplementary volume to his valuable 'Mechanical Dictionary,' incorporating the numerous inventions and improvements in mechanics since the publication of his previous volumes. Fortunately, he lived to complete the work, having put the finishing touches to it but a short time before his death. It will be published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

Chas. Scribner's Sons will shortly reprint for this country the 'Life of Lord Lawrence,' and have also in press 'Ice Pack and Tundra,' by W. H. Gilder; 'Historical Handbook of Italian Sculpture,' by Charles C. Perkins; a new American novel, 'An Honorable Surrender'; and a new edition of Dr. S. Wells Williams's 'The Middle Kingdom.'

Volume I of 'A History of the People of the United States, from the Revolution to the Civil War,' by Prof. John B. McMaster, is nearly ready to be brought out by D. Appleton & Co.

Henry Holt & Co. will be the American publishers of Miss Helen Zimmern's 'Epic of the Kings,' an English prose version of Firdusi's 'Shah-Nameh.'

Jowett's translation of Thucydides is announced by D. Lothrop & Co., Boston. Dr. Peabody, of Harvard, will furnish an introduction.

A 'Comparison of all Theologies,' by the Rev. James Freeman Clarke, being this author's Lowell lectures supplementary to his 'Ten Great Religions,' will be published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

John E. Potter & Co., Philadelphia, announce for immediate publication a 'Pictorial History of the Bible,' quarto.

'Walks in Southern Italy and Sicily,' by the Rev. Augustus J. C. Hare, is in preparation by Geo. Routledge & Sons.

Miss Hoppus, a young English authoress of much promise, has just written the concluding chapters of a story to which she gives the title of 'A Great Treason.' The scene is laid in America during the War of Independence.

Last summer we reviewed the Messrs. Holt's edition of Mr. Serjeant Ballantine's 'Some Experiences of a Barrister's Life.' This work has, since the author's arrival in America, been reproduced with his consent from the sixth London edition, and now bears the imprint of J. B. Lippincott & Co., the copyright being in the name of J. M. Stoddart, another Philadelphia publisher. Serjeant Ballantine supplies a special preface. The plates were purchased of the Messrs. Holt; the binding is a clever imitation in cloth of legal sheep.

From Ginn, Heath & Co. we have a treatise on 'Vibratory Motion and Sound,' by J. D. Everett, Professor of Natural Philosophy in Queens College, Belfast, and long and favorably known as an active and prominent member of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. The present treatise explains the laws of vibratory motion in perhaps as clear a manner as is possible in the present state of mathematical science. Many simple geometrical demonstrations are given of propositions which have heretofore been treated only by means of the higher branches of mathematics. The seventh chapter, which describes several ingenious methods of converting rectilinear into circular motion, and *vice versa*, is especially interesting. The theory of waves and undulations is presented in a very satisfactory manner. The laws of vibratory motion are the foundation of the modern theories of sound and light, and it is perhaps an introduction to acoustics and optics that the book will have its chief value. Chapter xii. of the work treats of "simple and compound tones"; and chapter xiii. and last, of "musical intervals." They are very short, and contain nothing new.

From the Clarendon Press, Oxford, we have a

new volume, Corneille's "Horace," edited, with introduction and notes, by George Saintsbury. It contains a very elaborate introduction, consisting of four essays upon French tragedy, a life of Corneille, and a special introduction to Horace, all good and interesting. The text is carefully edited, and the twenty-five pages of notes are among the best that have ever been appended to a French classic for school uses. They are sufficiently minute to give an idea, in a condensed form, of the criticism of words and grammatical forms to which French editors have subjected their classic writers, and at the same time they sufficiently bring out the high literary merits of the tragedy. Altogether this neat little volume is worthy to take its place by the side of the excellent editions of Shakspeare's plays issued from the same press.

A third, revised edition of Dr. James R. Nichols's "Whence, What, Where?" has just been published by A. Williams & Co., Boston.

Part 1 of the *Journal of Social Science*, embracing the papers read at Saratoga last summer before the American Association, is now procurable of the firm last mentioned or of G. P. Putnam's Sons. Two papers have an historic as well as social-economic interest—"Early Factory Life in New England," by Mrs. H. H. Robinson, and "American Factory Life," by Miss Lucy Larcom.

In the *Harvard University Bulletin* No. 24 is given the first instalment of the Cromwell and Frederic the Great books left by Carlyle to the University Library; and the beginning of a bibliography of Ptolemy's "Geography," by Mr. Winsor.

The current number of the *Magazine of American History* is noticeable for an imaginative article by the late Dr. J. G. Kohl, of Bremen, on the naming of Rhode Island. It displays critical acuteness and much ingenuity, but can hardly be said to settle the question.

The weekly issues of *Our Continent*, bound together as a monthly, show that this periodical rivals the magazines in the profuseness, though not (on the average) in the quality, of its illustrations. Like them, too, it sometimes suffers the illustrations to be cause of the articles rather than the reverse. The opening article is a good illustration of the danger of this want of logic in the editing.

The *American Angler* of this city is now publishing a series of essays upon the game fishes of America, and gives every week, on its front page, a cut of some representative American fish.

The students of the School of Drawing and Painting at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts have issued a December number of their publication launched in June—the *Art Student*. It offers a number of creditable examples of the work of the school—several from the life and from the nude—together with some note-book jottings, a promising etching, etc. The literary portion is agreeably youthful.

The Valentine Cards sent us by L. Prang & Co. do, as the publishers allege in their circular, convey "only the most pure and refined sentiment." They are not without interest as industrial and commercial products, and as "survivals" on the one hand, and "developments" on the other. As either art or literature they do not differ in quality from the holiday cards of the same enterprising firm.

As their Economic Tract No. 8, the Society for Political Education (4 Morton Street) have reprinted, by permission, Mr. F. W. Whitridge's, article on the caucus system from Vol. I. of Lalor's "Cyclopedia of Political Science."

Morris Coster, 1163 Broadway, has issued a Dutch-American 'Aïmanak en Jaarboekje voor het jaar 1883,' the first ever produced, as he in-

forms us. It contains information for immigrants, and celebrates the various Dutch churches of this city, with the aid of wood-cuts of the buildings themselves and of pastors. The publisher promises a better compilation hereafter.

Dr. C. H. F. Peters, of Hamilton College, has within a month past begun the publication of his *Celestial Charts*, the construction of which he commenced in 1860, according to the method described by him in the quarterly journal of the *Astronomische Gesellschaft* ten years ago. The charts were made with the thirteen-inch refracting telescope of the Litchfield Observatory—the same instrument with which so many additions to the group of small planets have been made by Dr. Peters. The faintest stars included are of the eleventh magnitude. The first issue embraces twenty charts, none of which exceed in declination twenty-five degrees either north or south of the equator. Each chart is twenty minutes long in right ascension, and five degrees broad in declination, thus covering nearly twenty-five square degrees of the celestial sphere. It is most gratifying that astronomers everywhere may now avail themselves of the great advantages to be derived from these charts, which have been, in part, so long in existence as manuscript. All the work, observations, reductions, and drafting, having been done by Dr. Peters without any assistance—and the expense of publication and gratuitous distribution being borne by him also—the celestial charts are likewise noteworthy as constituting a memorial quite unique in the life of an astronomer.

In the very handy little *Annuaire de l'Observatoire Royal de Bruxelles*, for 1883 (the fiftieth year of its issue), Professor Niesten gives a "Table des Comètes" which will be of great service in determining whether objects of this sort, so frequently discovered of late, are old or new. The table is compiled from all the best available authorities, and contains the usual elements of nearly three hundred comets; and they are arranged, not, as ordinarily in tables heretofore, in the order of time, but according to the constants of inclination of their orbits to the plane of the ecliptic. Sixty-seven comets fall between the inclinations zero and thirty degrees, 113 between thirty and sixty degrees, and 110 between sixty and ninety.

A translation into Greek of Professor Butcher's inaugural discourse, noticed in a recent number of the *Nation*, has appeared in the well-known *Kheios* of Trieste.

By the agreement between Germany and Greece in regard to the excavations at Olympia, Germany was to have one copy of all duplicates. The division of spoils has just been made by a commission appointed by Greece, and seven cases of the smaller objects have arrived at Berlin, the larger statues being stored for the present at Olympia. There are many terra-cottas and numerous archaic bronzes. One of the most precious of the latter is an image of a woman of extreme plainness, which is very ancient, for it came from the foundations of the temple of Juno, which is at least not later than the eighth century B. C. But German archaeologists just now are more occupied with a very remarkable find lately made in Saxony of a large gold fish, valued at 10,000 marks for the gold alone. It is covered with carvings in an archaic Greek style, representing mythological personages.

M. Oppert read lately before the *Académie des Inscriptions* a communication on a cylinder just deciphered by Mr. Pinches, of the British Museum, containing a curious inscription of King Nabonid, who reigned from 555 to 538 before our era. Nabonid, like the authorities of the British Museum, had been making excavations at Sippara, and had found "an inscription of Naram

Sin, son of Sargon, which for 3,200 years no king among our predecessors had seen." This will put the reign of Naram Sin at about 3750 B. C., and of Sargon, his father, at about 3800. Both kings were previously known by several texts, but not their date. Sargon is the king who tells of himself how he was, when an infant, exposed on the water in a basket, and saved by a peasant; a story which of course reminds one of Moses in the bulrushes.

More and more, as it seems to us, the leading articles in *Le Livre* claim the attention of its readers without omissions. "The Librarians of the Emperor Napoleon I." is the subject of the first in the January number, and is interesting for the light it throws on Napoleon's judgment and selection of men, and for a glimpse of the "695 volumes of jurisprudence, literature, ancient and modern history, military art, geography, travels, etc.," which he took with him upon his abdication to Elba. In the second, a book illustrator who survives his generation, M. Camille Rogier, furnishes M. Eugène Forgues an agreeable topic, and justifies the reproduction of some of the artist's designs. The third paper has a greater value than the foregoing, for it tells of the formation, neglect, and restoration of the unsurpassed library of the Paris Conservatoire de Musique. It is only lately that full effect has been given to the royal ordinance of March 29, 1834, providing for the deposit in this collection of a copy of every musical publication in France; but now the library is very much in the condition of that of Congress, and books piled upon the floors are fast choking the passages and making research impracticable. Both Berlioz and Félicien David held the post of librarian, but treated it as a sinecure, and left the library worse than they found it. In the present custodian, M. Weckerlin, the right man has been found for the right place. He has in particular, besides a general methodical rearrangement and filling up of lacunæ, made a collection of more than 1,500 musical portraits, and another of autographs, equally precious; and, finally, he has substituted a card catalogue for the former folio. The veteran statesman Victor Schœlcher, a passionate admirer of Handel and collector of his works, has given his invaluable Handel library to that of the Conservatoire.

In addition to the Italian *Esploratore* there is to be a new *L'Esplorazione*, "a fortnightly review of geographical achievement and of Italian interests in all parts of the globe." The editors are Prof. G. B. Licata, of the African Society, and Chev. F. Borsari, Secretary of Committee of the Third International Geographical Congress. The place of publication is Naples, Largo Carolina, 1. The first number, now before us, bears date of Jan. 15, 1883. Reviews of geographical publications, and particularly of Italian text-books, "whose mode of compilation is generally deplorable," form a part of the programme.

—We regret to record the death, on February 2, of Prof. George Washington Greene, in the seventy-second year of his age, and in his native town, East Greenwich, R. I. He was a grandson of the revolutionary General Nathaniel Greene, and his life of this ancestor, of which the third and last volume was published in 1871, is his most enduring monument, and in its class is not surpassed by any American biography. Prof. Greene belonged to the generation which was outraged by Mr. George Bancroft's judgments and imputations on its grandsires, and which had both the requisite knowledge and literary skill to repel them. His education, begun but not carried far in Brown University, was completed by study abroad, which was favored by a long residence in Rome as U. S.

consul (1837-45). In the spring of 1848 he was appointed instructor in modern languages at Brown, and in 1852 became a resident of this city for a period of some dozen years, during which he was engaged on the life of General Greene. In 1865 he put forth the admirable 'Historical View of the American Revolution,' composed of his Lowell lectures in 1863. Other works, showing the versatility of his scholarship—such as his 'Historical Studies' (relating especially to Italian genius and literature), republished in 1850 from the *North American Review*, and his 'History and Geography of the Middle Ages' (1851)—might be enumerated. In 1872 he was appointed non-resident Professor of American History at Cornell University. He was for many years an esteemed contributor to the *Nation*. In spite of his failing eyesight, he continued his literary labors to the last, and was, we believe, contemplating a life of the poet Longfellow, between whom and himself a very warm friendship existed.

—We have received from D. Appleton & Co. the first volume of the new edition of Bancroft's 'History of the United States,' an edition which will contain in six volumes the substance of the original twelve. It is a handsome octavo, well printed on good, but not very heavy, paper. Although considerably thicker than a single volume of the original edition, it is not at all clumsy or cumbersome. On comparing this with the corresponding volume of the "Centenary" edition of 1876, one is surprised to see how extensive changes the author has found desirable, even after so short an interval. The comparison of the three editions illustrates his untiring energy and faithfulness of preparation, as well as, perhaps, a certain restlessness and captiousness of self criticism. The first thing that strikes one is the increased number of chapters, resulting from subdivision. This volume contains two volumes of the original, and is divided into thirty-eight chapters instead of eighteen. This is in itself an improvement. The original chapters were unduly long; the new ones are some of them too short; but, on the whole, short chapters are far more manageable for the reader than long ones, even where, as in this case, there is an excellent analytic table of contents. But the new arrangement is not the result merely of subdivision: the matter is rearranged in such a manner as vastly to increase the lucidity and continuousness of treatment. For example, chapter viii. (the same in both the earlier editions), "The Pilgrims," is divided into two chapters—chapter xi., "Prelates and Puritans," and chapter xii., "The Pilgrims." But this is not enough. The chapter originally contained several pages upon the early explorations of New England, which could not but be felt to be out of place, standing as they did between the headings "Influence of Calvin" and "The Reformation in Germany." These pages are now removed, so that the treatment of the religious movement is uninterrupted, and the irrelevant matter is incorporated partly in chapter v., "The English Attempt Colonization," partly in chapter vi., "England Plants a New Nation in Virginia." The substance of the one chapter is therefore now found distributed among four. In the present edition Mr. Bancroft returns to the principle of division into periods, abandoned in the "Centenary" edition. His division is, however, a new one, the present volume containing two periods, or rather parts—Part 1, "The English People Found a Nation in America"; Part 2, "The Colonies Obtain Geographical Unity"—thus emphasizing an historical fact of great importance. Each part consists of nineteen chapters. As the permanent shape taken by a great historical work, this new

arrangement—which we have thought it worth while to describe at some length—is certainly an improvement, and probably a desirable one. It must, however, make the work of citation and reference rather hard. It is a great convenience in referring, for example, to Gibbon, to know that in all editions chapter xv. is one and the same; and Bancroft's is a work which will always be extensively cited. The author tells us in his preface, with a certain pathetic dignity, that this revision "must be his last." However this may be, the spectacle of two men past eighty busily engaged in carrying on the literary labors which they began when young, is an inspiring one to all students of history. If Bancroft does not stand—as no living historian does—upon the same plane as Ranke, their names will, at any rate, ever be joined by virtue of this association.

—'Dr. Breen's Practice,' it appears, illustrates, rather unexpectedly, the truth that "we are a great nation." The contrast between the manners of *jeunes américaines* abroad and the prejudice with which Grace Breen's setting up as a doctor is received in her country town, has struck a French critic. He sees that there may be varieties in American character, notwithstanding that dreadful monotony which English travelers who spend four or five weeks in traversing a country as large as Europe discover on the surface. A French mother who sees a stranger violate with utter unconcern some of the most sacred laws of social propriety, thinks she has entirely accounted for it by saying, "Oh, she is an American." Yet Dr. Mulbridge refused to consult with a woman, and Dr. Breen's very friends would not trust her in a real illness, but wanted a *doctor*. Even in Paris, female medical students are better received than this. Our critic has heard some of the most eminent members of the Faculty of Medicine speak of one or two of their theses as among the most remarkable of the last few years. Conclusion: Americans—some Americans—have prejudices, like the rest of the world; there are conservatives even in the country of radicals. But after all the critic is not quite fair to us. He does not believe in female physicians, but he attributes his own doubts, not to stupid conservatism, but to perception of the plain laws of nature. He quotes a sentence of Mlle. Aubertine Auclere written to the Municipal Council of Paris: "It is a shame that men should make women their milch cows," and declares he cannot find that men have ever done so. It seems to him that it is Nature who is responsible for this division of labor. Until it is proved that the injustice of society has made women mothers and men fathers, and that a law could remedy all this, he for his part will continue to believe that the two sexes were created for different ends, and consequently have received different faculties and aptitudes. "Not that either is therefore superior to the other, but they are not the same, that is all." Very well, if these are the reasons that convince an Arvédé Barine that doctors should always be men, may not the most hide-bound conservative of a New England village be in part influenced by the same idea?

—Karl Blind, in an article in the Vienna *Neue Freie Presse*, notes the curious fact that the recent revelations regarding Darwin's religious opinions were only noticed by three or four of the English periodicals, and that even *Nature* suppressed Darwin's letter to a Jena student, which Haeckel had sent to the editor as part of one of his lectures. In this letter, it will be remembered, Darwin had stated, verbatim: "For myself, I do not believe that there ever has been any revelation"; and in a conversation with Dr. Ludwig Büchner, he said he was with him in thought, but preferred the word agnostic to atheist, and that he had given up Christianity

because "it is not supported by evidence." Karl Blind adds to this testimony another item, in the form of a letter written by Darwin in 1873 to a Dutch gentleman, N. D. Doedes, of which we make the following translation from the German as given in the *Presse*:

"I find it impossible to give a brief answer to your question. I do not know if I should be able to answer it if I were to write a great deal about it. Thus much I can say, that the impossibility of understanding how this great and wonderful universe, besides our own consciousness, could have come into existence through chance, seems to me to be our principal argument for the existence of a God; but whether this argument is of any value I have never been able to decide, for I know that, if we accept a highest cause, the mind again strives to know whence it came and how it arose. Moreover, I cannot pass over the difficulty which, on this assumption, arises from the vast amount of suffering prevalent in the world. I am, indeed, asked to attach a certain amount of weight to the judgment of the large number of intelligent men who have implicitly believed in God; but here again I see what an insufficient kind of proof this is. The safest conclusion seems to be that the whole subject lies beyond the range of human understanding; and yet—a man can do his duty."

—We have met with some most alarming statistics in a German writer. Every one knows that there is a Goethe bibliomania as there is a Shakspeare mania and a Molière mania, and Calderon and Cervantes manias, and as we thought last year there was going to be a Longfellow mania. Now, the result of the German epidemic is that, whereas in 1808 there had been printed in one place or another 3,900 letters of Goethe addressed to 340 different persons, in 1879, only eleven years later, there were, we are told, 8,600, written to 600 correspondents. The reader will notice that the two dates are separated by a sun spot interval, though it is not said that this has anything to do with the result. But what a terrible prospect! By 1890, at the same rate, there will be 20,640; in 1901, 45,408; and by the end of that century no library could contain them, and not even a German professor would be able to read them through. Perhaps it is in view of this that Goedecke and Vollmer are preparing a "critical and definitive" edition of all the works in the 'Bibliothek der Weltliteratur.' For the letters are not the only works of Goethe that are growing. During his life only one form of "Goetz von Berlichingen," was printed, that of 1773. Now there are three. The text of 1772, which was never performed, was published after the poet's death. Still later came the arrangement of 1804, which had increased (as we have seen to be the habit of the works of this writer) so much that, like Wagner's operas, it could not all be performed on one day, and three acts were played September 29, the rest on October 13. This enlarged *recension* was found in a closet at Munich, was acquired by the Heidelberg University Library, and is now published by Professor Baechtold. "Iphigenia," too, is growing by gemmation, like the fungi: a new text arrangement (*redaction*), by the poet's own hand, has been discovered. We say growing, because these sister texts are not used to give various readings, as in editing the Greek and Latin classics, but both texts are printed by any conscientious German editor at full length. At least that is what Professor Baechtold has done for "Goetz von Berlichingen," and what he will probably do for "Iphigenia."

—At least six worthy editions of Molière's complete works are now passing through the press in Paris, and there is never a month and rarely a week which does not record the publication of some book or pamphlet about the master mind of the French drama. Among the latest of these many volumes is one which is highly characteristic of the length to which a literary passion and a thirst for discovery may lead a

patient critic. M. Auguste Vitu, the brilliant dramatic critic of the *Figaro*, has just published a book on the house in which Molière died, which he identifies with the present No. 40 of the Rue Richelieu, although unfortunately no vestige of the original edifice remains, save a well in the party-wall, now covered out of sight. Hitherto it has been supposed that the house was No. 34, and an inscription on its front sets forth the belief. But M. Vitu marshals a host of new witnesses, the best of them being extracts from family papers of the present owners, some of which are almost contemporary with Molière's death. The real house was built in 1658 and leased by Molière in July, 1673. It overlooked on the rear the garden of the Palais Royal, to which Molière had a key, and through which he could thus take a short cut to his theatre, standing then very nearly on the ground now occupied by its successor, the Théâtre-Français of to-day. But he did not live long to enjoy it, nor did he enjoy it much while he lived. He got possession in the first week of October, 1672, and on October 11 his second son died; in the next few months he was hard at work rehearsing the "Malade Imaginaire," a very genuine invalid himself; and after the first performance of the new play he was brought home to die in an upper room, on February 17, 1673. Most interesting is M. Vitu's reconstruction of this fatal abode. The consideration of this house, however, fills only the first seventy pages of his 'Maison Mortuaire de Molière' (Paris: Lemerre; New York: F. W. Christern), the remaining 400 pages of which are taken up with a history of the Rue de Richelieu, house by house—a history now told for the first time from researches in the archives, public and private, of Paris. M. Vitu announces as in press similar exhaustive volumes on two other Molièrian houses—the tennis court which the illustre Théâtre hired, and Molière's father's house in the Halles.

—The January number of the *Rundschau* is the one hundredth issue of that periodical. Of its 160 pages, no less than 74 are devoted to fiction. L. Friedländer has an article on Roman Strategy, and Freiherr von Goltz one on Africa. Freiherr von der Brüggen considers the relation between Church and State, in an essay on the evangelic-religious movement in Russia, which throws light on the moral condition of that nation and the efforts of propagandists to introduce New Testament teachings. Besides the regular bibliographic, artistic, and literary notices, there is a long article by Karl Frenzel on the Berlin theatres, which not only reviews the new plays produced within the last few months, but incidentally gives a clear view of the condition of the German drama in general. The Germans evidently do not lack interest in theatres. Berlin has one theatre to every 68,000 inhabitants; Paris, one to every 70,000. Hamburg has four theatres, Munich three. Since 1870, permission has been given to private theatres to make use of the classical repertory of which, before that date, the Court theatres had a monopoly. The poorer classes, who were unable to pay the prices asked at the royal theatres, were thus allowed to become familiar with these plays, and it became possible to give such performances as those of the Meiningen Company, in which every detail is represented with historical accuracy and great splendor. But the great desideratum at present is new plays. Everybody writes them, many are printed and acted, but few succeed. The Schiller prize has not been assigned for several years. No one could rival the classical drama except Wagner, who has had the assistance of music. Anzengruber, Wilbrandt, Lindau, Putlitz, Bürger, L'Arronge gave up the unequal contest, and applied themselves, with more or less suc-

cess, to the treatment of modern social problems and conflicts. This year, however, a reaction seems to have set in, in favor of Wildenbruch, whose historical play, "Harold," made a great sensation in Berlin and elsewhere. But Herr Frenzel believes that, like other reactions in favor of tragedy, this one will be limited to a single author or even to a single play.

TROLLOPE'S LORD PALMERSTON.

Lord Palmerston. By Anthony Trollope. London: Wm. Isbister.

"In his sixty-seventh year (January, 1851) he [Lord Palmerston] wrote to his brother from Broadlands. Speaking of the Christmas just past, he says: 'I took a fling, and went out several days hunting and shooting in the fine of the early day, coming home, of course, for work earlier than if I had been only a sportsman.' Let gentlemen of sixty-seven who habitually go out hunting and shooting—for I am aware that there are Englishmen of the age who do so—be-think themselves of the manner in which they pass the remainder of the day after they have come home. Are they tired, and do they sleep, or sit over their tea? Do they congratulate themselves that at sixty-seven they have been still able to perform so well many of the feats of their youth? I think I may say that they none of them betake themselves to the hard, thoughtful work of their lives: and that, if such work still falls to their lot, it has to be done before they go out hunting or shooting."

This paragraph from Mr. Trollope's work has a twofold interest. It exhibits Mr. Trollope's special gifts as a biographer; it also draws attention to the main secret or explanation of Lord Palmerston's success as a statesman.

The best talent which the writer of biography can possess is the capacity for seizing the personality of his hero; the power, that is to say, of seeing all the character which is shown in small personal traits, or the way in which petty facts of every-day life are the best illustration of character. The possession by Mr. Trollope of this gift or power is manifest in every line of his reflections on the very simple sentence from Lord Palmerston's correspondence. Most of us would have passed over the words which convey so much to Mr. Trollope without any particular attention. Some of us would have noted them as showing that Palmerston was a genial English gentleman with the tastes of a country squire. Very few would have seen, as Mr. Trollope perceived at a glance, all the physical and mental energy implied in the fact that a gentleman of sixty-seven could for two or three days together have a fling with the hounds in the early part of the day, and then come home for hard work in the afternoon. Nor is it difficult to perceive why Mr. Trollope saw so much more meaning in Lord Palmerston's habits than would be apparent to an ordinary reader: the training of the novelist came in to aid the labors of the biographer. For the greater part of his active life Mr. Trollope observed, reflected upon, and noted down the ways of English gentlemen. The whole of his works may be described under the title of one of them—they might all be headed, 'The Way We Live Now.' Hence, when he learned that a gentleman well advanced in years found it easy to hunt in the morning and work hard in the evening, Mr. Trollope could in a moment compare Palmerston's manner of life with the existence of the other squires and country gentlemen whom he has painted in 'Framley Parsonage,' 'Orley Farm,' 'The Last Chronicle of Barset,' or in any other among the score of pictures of modern England which he has left behind him for the entertainment of the present and the instruction of many a future generation. He thought of all his worthy friends as they came in wearied and worn-out from the hunting-field; he imagined them sipping tea, lounging in their easy-chairs, nodding

over a book before dinner, or falling fast asleep after dinner, undisturbed by the music of their daughters or by the conversation of the youngsters who talked around them. He compared the squires he had known or imagined—knowledge and imagination may in this case be pretty much identified—and contrasted the minister of sixty-seven with the whole of the group. With this gallery of English portraits before him, Mr. Trollope could see at a hint where Palmerston agreed and where Palmerston differed from other Englishmen.

Add to this, that novel-writing, whatever its defects as a training for the intellect (and these defects are not inconsiderable), leads any one who practises the art to avoid abstractions. A successful novelist must train himself to look at men as they are. Hence a biography by a writer such as Trollope may have many deficiencies, but the one fault which it hardly can have is the fault, common enough to many distinguished writers, of treating a statesman as if he were merely the incarnation of some principles of statesmanship, instead of being, as he must of necessity be, a man of human flesh and blood, who, though occupied in politics as other men are occupied in the practice of the law or the transaction of business, is, like all of us, mainly taken up in hundreds of concerns and interests which have no direct reference to the pursuit which has made him famous. Mr. Trollope, at any rate, never forgot or suffered his readers to forget that Palmerston was a living, vigorous man of marked virtues, and of equally marked faults, whom it was absolutely impossible to treat as a mere representative of Palmerstonian policy.

Whoever wishes to measure the merit no less than the deficiencies of Mr. Trollope as a biographer, will find few better modes of doing so than by comparing the small, superficial, and probably ephemeral 'Lord Palmerston' with Mr. John Morley's lengthy and elaborate 'Cobden,' which may probably be a lasting memorial both of Cobden's policy and of the views maintained by Cobden's biographer. In many respects Mr. Trollope's work is sure to suffer by the proposed comparison. Mr. Morley is a trained thinker; his book bears throughout the traces of thought; he is the advocate or exponent of something like a political system; his 'Life of Cobden' is an exposition or defence of Cobdenism. Mr. Morley, further, is, as every one who has studied his writings must perceive, one of the most conscientious of workers; he has, it is clear, carefully examined every topic which in his judgment required to be studied by any one who undertook to narrate the history of the work done by Cobden for the world. Mr. Trollope, on the other hand, never professed to be, and certainly was not, a master of political theories. His observations on politics, whether in his novels or elsewhere, never go very deep. A good deal may be learned, even about social or political questions, from Mr. Trollope's descriptions of character and of society; but there is rarely much instruction to be got from his set remarks on public affairs. His 'Palmerston,' it must be admitted, is sketchy. No one will be surprised to find it in some respects inaccurate, as it certainly is in many respects superficial.

Yet, for all this, Mr. Trollope's work possesses one merit which is not to be found in Mr. Morley's 'Cobden': it contains a picture of Palmerston. Mr. Morley's two volumes contain, not a portrait of Cobden, but a treatise on Cobden's doctrine. Unless it be the one graphic and powerful description of the blow which befell Cobden on the death of his son, we doubt whether there is one picture throughout the whole of Mr. Morley's pages. Such a passage as that which we have cited from Trollope's 'Palmer-

ston's, we are well assured, not to be found in the length and breadth of the whole of the didactic biographies with which Mr. Morley has instructed, and we may also add interested, the world. The truth is, that Mr. Trollope did not study, and perhaps would not have understood, sociology or political science; but he did thoroughly observe English society. He knew much less of man than of men, but of men he knew a great deal, and the men he understood best were Englishmen. Hence Lord Palmerston's account of his hunting and his working not only conveyed to Trollope, as we have already pointed out, a real glimpse into Palmerston's character, but also enabled the trained novelist to give to his readers, in the form of a few casual reflections on the way in which Palmerston spent his time, something like a key to the causes of Palmerston's success as a statesman.

Palmerston, happily for Mr. Trollope's reputation, was one of those persons whom the sympathetic painter of modern English society could thoroughly understand. His Lordship was not a man of genius or originality; he was not a great orator; he was not one of those leaders who tower above their fellows; he was not gifted with any extraordinary grasp of intellect or with any very remarkable originality of character. He received from nature the best outfit for success—genuine success—in the affairs of life which any man can desire. He was endowed, not with extraordinary qualities, but with an extraordinary amount of various valuable, though not in themselves uncommon, qualities. At the bottom of his success lay, as Mr. Trollope points out in effect in the passage we have cited, the possession of perfect physical health and strength. A strong body is, as we have all of us been taught from our youth up, often enough (and perhaps a good deal too often) a very inferior thing to mental or moral excellence. Teachers who are so careful to impress this maxim on the mind of youth appear to forget that a strong, and above all a healthy, body (the two things are by no means the same) is, if not the necessary yet certainly the natural, foundation for a strong character and a healthy mind. Lord Palmerston's physical endowments exactly represented his mental and moral gifts. England has possessed several better, nobler, and more far-sighted statesmen; but it may well be doubted whether among the line of English ministers will be found more than, at the most, two or three men who, in combined soundness of judgment, firmness of resolution, and energy of action, equalled Palmerston.

In nothing was his strong sense better seen than in a characteristic of his career on which Mr. Trollope has laid just emphasis—namely, the utter absence of all effort to push himself unduly forward, and even the cautious avoidance of undertaking any duties for which he was not fully prepared. This determination to bide his time is the characteristic of a strong man. The impatience which forces weaker natures to seize on positions which they can hardly hold with credit is, to a certain extent, connected with the sense of physical weakness or disease. He who has no certainty that his life will be long, feels that he cannot sacrifice the chances of the present day for the better opportunities which may never be his. The man of vigorous body has within himself the presage of a long life. Looking for a lengthy existence, he can play a waiting and therefore, in many cases, a wise game. Healthiness, again, is at least half the secret of sound judgment. Morbid feeling is the almost certain concomitant of a sickly body; but morbid sentiment is a fatal bar to forming a correct estimate of other men's character. There is no proof that Palmerston was gifted with any

of the intuition of genius. He assuredly had strong feelings and strong prejudices. But, on the whole, his fairness and soundness of judgment led him right, both in his views of character and in his decision as to the course of action to be adopted at a given moment. He was utterly free from cant and from a belief in formulas, and he was, it must be added, like most persons of a coarse and vigorous nature, not very tightly bound to general political principles. His dealings with Louis Napoleon show him both at his worst and at his best. He had no special liking for Napoleon III. at any period of that adventurer's career; but Palmerston, it must now be admitted, perceived at the time of the *Coup d'État* one or two facts completely hidden from every Englishman of note, unless we except (the exception is an odd one) Walter Bagehot. He saw, more clearly perhaps than the President himself, that the name of Napoleon had a real hold on the French people; he held—and subsequent events have amply justified Palmerston's judgment—that the Orleanists and the so-called Party of Order hated the Empire a great deal more than they loved liberty, and were not much more concerned to support the Republic than was the President who overthrew it. He probably underrated—though this is not quite certain—the power of Republicanism in France, and he certainly grievously, and with very discreditable want of moral insight, overlooked the flagrant immorality of the *Coup d'État*. Still, for the purposes of immediate action, and especially for determining the course to be taken by English statesmanship, it must now be admitted that Palmerston took as clear and true a view of the crisis in 1851 and 1852 as any English statesman.

The alliance, it should be noted, with Louis Napoleon—or rather with France—was used by Palmerston for objects which he judged to be of paramount importance to England and to Europe. He was, moreover (and this is the point to be specially noticed), not the least disposed to let himself be hoodwinked by his ally. "The Emperor's mind," he writes in 1859 or 1860, "is as full of schemes as a warren is full of rabbits, and, like rabbits, his schemes go to ground for the moment to avoid notice or antagonism." In another letter, he tells the Duke of Somerset: "I have watched the Emperor narrowly, and have studied his character and conduct. You may rely upon it that at the bottom of his heart there lurks an inextinguishable desire to humble and punish England." And Palmerston was always ready to act upon his own convictions of political expediency. In a private conversation with the French Ambassador, he said outright that England desired peace, but that if the Emperor wished for war he would find that England was quite ready for him. Can any one who remembers 1870 doubt both that Palmerston had rightly gauged Louis Napoleon's character, and that his bold words were the wisest and most effective means of meeting the plots of a conspirator whose hesitation was equal to his faithlessness? Compare Lord Palmerston's insight with Cobden's complete blindness as to the real character of a statesman whose intellectual appreciation of free trade covered a multitude of sins in the eyes of the great free-trader.

In point of moral obtuseness, Palmerston and Cobden stand pretty much on the same level. Each was prepared far too readily to condone the crime of December. The unscrupulosity of Cobden was, it is true, the kind of unscrupulosity which is common to enthusiasts, religious or otherwise, to whom the "cause" is everything; and the man who promotes the "cause" cannot, whatever his offences, be a bad man. The unscrupulosity of Palmerston was the unscrupu-

losity of the man of the world, who takes things as they are, and is far too willing to shake hands with a scoundrel if the scoundrel's friendship is of value. But if you waive the moral question, Palmerston has, in every point of view, the advantage of Cobden. The old minister used his eyes and ears, watched the Emperor narrowly, and saw clearly enough how the land lay. The free-trader clung tight to his economical principles, made up his mind truly enough that it was not the "interest" of France to attack England, or for that matter Germany, and therefore derided all fear of invasion on the part whether of Englishmen or of Prussians. The plain truth is, that Palmerston had in great perfection the qualities, not in themselves very rare qualities, of a good working political leader. He could, when necessary, at any rate in his younger days, recognize the force of new ideas. Though a disciple of Canning, he placed himself in time on the side of parliamentary reform, and, though a nobleman and a landowner, saw at least as soon as others of his class the truth of free trade. But he was neither a man of original conceptions nor a man endowed with any special aptitude for grasping general ideas or principles.

As one looks over the whole of his life, as narrated rather too sympathetically by Mr. Trollope, one can see why Palmerston was hated, the extent to which the aversion felt to him by many opponents was justified, and the kind of defence which can justly be made for his policy and influence. He was a man of rather common qualities, who, by virtue of judgment, force, and often of rather vulgar self-assertion, defeated men of greater intellectual powers than himself. Mr. Trollope's comparison between Palmerston and Guizot is, by way of contrast, a very apt one. We may feel perfectly sure that, measured as men of intellect, the English minister fell far short of his French rival. Guizot will occupy a permanent place in literature after the failure of his policy is entirely forgotten. Palmerston neither by word nor writing contributed a single thought to the stock of human knowledge. But in politics Guizot failed as markedly as Palmerston succeeded. Nor let any one attribute this to the injustice of fortune. Palmerston succeeded because he had what Guizot had not—an eye for facts, and vigor to act in accordance with the facts of each crisis in so far as he perceived them. Let any one compare the miserable intrigue by which the French minister tried to support the Sonderbund, with the energy with which Palmerston really did support the cause of the Swiss Federation, and he will soon admit that Guizot's permanent banishment from the political life of France was as just and as natural as Palmerston's life-long influence on the politics of England. Cobden and Bright hated Palmerston partly because he was the most vigorous and dangerous opponent of their political system, partly, and more justly, because he represented that kind of hand-to-mouth statesmanship which all but refuses to look to anything more than the immediate exigencies of the day, and which entirely declines to recognize the often very important truths of economists and other theorists who are in certain respects in advance of their age. No one can say that this tendency simply to "deal with things as they occur," which is characteristic of all English statesmanship, and more especially characteristic of Palmerstonian statesmanship, is without its grave evils. The fourteen years from 1850 to 1864 were, as one now sees or imagines, a period when much might have been done to anticipate or avert the difficulties which now beset English statesmanship in Ireland. Palmerston knew in some respects more of Ireland

than most premiers. He did nothing whatever to modify the Irish policy of England.

Yet the very hand-to-mouth character of Palmerstonian statesmanship suggests to a certain extent the defence of his policy, and the true apology or explanation for the confidence placed in him, and men like him, by the English people. Whatever may be the case centuries hence, politics is not now a science, nor anything like a science. There are, it is true, a certain, though very limited, number of principles, mainly economical, to which every competent statesman ought to take heed in the conduct of affairs. There are, further, doctrines of justice and humanity which, though their application may sometimes be a little difficult, cannot be neglected by any one who believes that the aim of political as of other human efforts is to promote the welfare of mankind. But the immediate calling of every statesman is to deal with occasions as they arise. He has, at best, before him in many instances but a choice of evils. For this rough-and-ready work of every-day politics, presence of mind, energy, decision, insight into character, knowledge of men, and belief in plain dealing are for the most part of far greater avail to a minister than the rarer gifts of eloquence or genius. With the qualities needed for the every-day work of politics Palmerston was endowed, and the English people followed a competent leader who was known to care for the interests of England as they always have followed, and to the end of time probably will follow, men of the Palmerstonian stamp. If Palmerston were alive, he would probably even now, under conditions not very favorable to his influence, soon return to power. Let no one suppose that Mr. Gladstone's immense authority is inconsistent with this assertion. The present Premier, who, be it remarked to the credit of both statesmen, served zealously under Palmerston, has an infinite number of gifts not possessed by Mr. Trollope's hero. But it is very questionable whether the hold on popular sympathy undoubtedly possessed by Mr. Gladstone is not due as much to the qualities which are common to him and to Palmerston as to the qualities which will always, from some points of view, render the one minister a marked contrast to the other. Immense strength of body, unwearied love of work, unbounded determination, amounting at times to arrogance, great capacity for acting boldly when requisite on the spur of the moment, are characteristics which, though in a somewhat different form, marked the policy of Palmerston as they now mark the policy of Gladstone. The minister who has bombarded Alexandria and has occupied Egypt has not much to learn in the way of prompt energy from the Premier who sent the Guards to Canada, and was prepared to declare war with the United States rather than tolerate the seizure of the representatives of the Confederacy. Both Palmerston and Gladstone have thoroughly understood that it is the electors, and not the House of Commons, who are the ultimate sovereign of England. The differences between the two men are patent; the one, however, was, and the other is, the really strong man, both physically and morally, of his day. The future biographer of Mr. Gladstone will, if he knows his work, tell how his hero cut down trees and returned to the labors of a minister after going through the toil of a woodman, just as Mr. Trollope tells us how Palmerston, when an old man, rode out with the hounds in the morning, and then in the afternoon worked at memoranda and despatches a good deal harder than any young Foreign-Office clerk.

"SCHAFF-HERZOG."

A Religious Encyclopædia, or Dictionary of Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal, and Practical Theology. Based on the Real-Encyclopædie of Herzog, Plitt, and Hauck. Edited by Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Associate Editors: Rev. Samuel M. Jackson, M.A., and Rev. D. S. Schaff. Volume I. Funk & Wagnalls. 1882.

THIS is a stately volume of 850 very large pages. The work is to be completed in three volumes. Herzog's original *Real-Encyclopædie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* (1854-68) embraced twenty-two, including the supplement. His new edition, begun in 1877, on which Dr. Schaff's publication is based, is to consist of not less than fifteen, of which ten have appeared. Dr. Schaff's three, comparing the number and size of the pages and the type, will contain more print than four of Herzog's. Judicious condensation and a strict excision of repetitions might have considerably increased the comparative amount of matter, in the higher sense; but no such process, except in trifles, is to be discovered. The *Religious Encyclopædia* is in reality neither a translation nor an abridgment of the *Real-Encyclopædie*, but "a condensed reproduction and adaptation of all the important German articles, with necessary additions, especially in the literature, and with a large number of new articles by the editors and special contributors. More than one-third of the work is original. Every article is credited to its author, except the majority of editorial articles, which are unsigned." Much British and American biography has been added. "Living celebrities are excluded." The bibliography has been brought down to date. The "List of Writers," which comprises the contributors, living and dead, for both the German and the American work, represents a tremendous array of learning; but, unfortunately, some of the best contributions have been left out or badly cut up in the American reproduction, and a very large portion of the original American matter has been contributed by writers not deemed worthy of a place in the list, or belongs to the "unsigned" part of the editorial labor. Herzog himself, like his associate editor Plitt, is now numbered among the dead contributors.

The comparison of a number of successive notices may show how far the *Religious Encyclopædia* differs as to contents from the *Real-Encyclopædie*. The latter devotes eight pages, by Pastor Michelsen, to Lars Anderson, the greatest promoter of the reformation in Sweden; the *Religious Encyclopædia* replaces them by eighteen lines, beginning thus: "Anderson, Lars (*Laurentius Andra*), b. probably at Streugnäs [sic, for Strengnäs], 1480; d. in the same place, April 29, 1552; was chancellor of the realm and most intimate councillor of the King from 1523 to 1540, and stood together with Olans [sic, for Olaus] and Laurentius Petri," etc. The reader soon enough discovers that "the realm" means Sweden, and in some other article he may find out that "the King" means Gustavus Vasa. Schaff gives a life of Rufus Anderson, "D.D., LL.D.," who "was president for many years of the trustees of Bradford Academy; a member of the board of trust of Andover Seminary; was active in benevolence"; Herzog knows no such man. Schaff alone has an article on Andover Theological Seminary—an article teeming with "Rev.," "Dr.," "D.D.," "Hon.," "Esq.," and "Madam"—and some lines on Antonio Andrada, the author of *Novo Descobrimento do Grão [Grão] Catayo on [ou] dos Reynos de Thibet*, and also on Diogo Andrada—a name

changed in the same notice into Andradias. The *Religious Encyclopædia* abridges the *Real-Encyclopædie's* lives of Jakob and Johann Valentin Andra, and adds brief notices of Abraham Andra, of Andreas Cretensis and Andreas of Cæsarea in Cappadocia—misplacing these two both alphabetically and chronologically—and of Andreas "of Crain" (that is, which is not stated, of Carniola). Herzog has, of course, a notice of the apostle "Andreas"; Schaff forgets the apostle, both as Andreas and as Andrew.

The preceding will have incidentally shown our readers that slight editorial slips are not unfrequent in the new work before us. Dr. Schaff himself tells us in the preface that "an apology may be due the German authors for abridging their contributions"; ample apology is surely due for abridging them carelessly and revising the abridgments with equal carelessness. The German authors and editors are perfectly guiltless of such Hebrew as "g'natz" (page 90, where ignorance of the language terribly distorts the accurate statements of Schürer), "shūbāth" (550), "horbāh" and "y'shimōkh" (629), "b'nē v'eden" (692), or "giddūy" (783); such Assyrian as "Acha-abbre" (41); such Italian as "Pitture Sacre . . . Dei Cemeteri di Roma" and "delli Antiche Arti" (417); such French as "la génie" (175), "des Église Réformées" (222), "la Républiques" (228), "Révue des Deux Mondes" (320), "cœur humaine" (337), "Répertoire Assyrienne" (585), or "demotique," "rituel funéraire," "le Bible," and "notices recueilles" (all on page 707); such renderings of Hebrew words or names in English as "Sichem" (15), "Sohar" (immediately after "Hazohar," 253), "Ehejekel" (354), "Juda ben Isaak" (355), or "Chiddekel" (690); such spellings of classical names, in an English text with the ordinary rules, as "Berōa" (80), "Ktesiphon" (187), "Kallistus" and "Philokalus" (416), "Kalykadnus" (577), or "Ktesias" (side by side with "Cyrus," "Cambyes," and even "Ctesias," on p. 597); and such geographical nomenclature as "Münich" (four times in one column, 225), "Freisig" (for Freisingen, 225), "Méaux" (three times in a few lines, 325), or "Osnabrück" (513). Nor are the German authors or editors responsible for the frequent omission of Greek accents; for the almost general omission of definitions after the titles; and such awkward beginnings of notices as "Ahimelech (*brother of the king*) was probably a son of Abiah," "Alexandria, founded in 322 [sic, for 332] B.C. by Alexander the Great, rose rapidly," and "Chili, The Republic of, established Feb. 16, 1817, and [sic] numbered 1,938,861 inhabitants in 1869"; for beginnings, on the other hand, so gushing as "Brooks, . . . an able and beloved minister of the Universalist Church," or "Budington, . . . a beloved and able Congregational minister"; or for references to titles which do not exist in the book, as to "Accad" (p. 583), which ought to be there.

We would not dwell on editorial slips like these, were such the only ones; but graver offences are equally frequent, and we have neither room nor time to point them out. A few examples, however, must be presented: Paul de Lagarde's "Abulfaradsch" is editorially reproduced in twenty lines, of which thirteen are devoted to a very imperfect enumeration of books and editions. The life proper is condensed in this one sentence of characteristic construction: "Abulfaraj (*Bar Hebraeus*), b. at Malatia in Cappadocia, 1236; d. at Maragha in Adharbaidshan [sic]; the son of a Jewish physician, who had embraced Jacobinism; was appointed Bishop of Gubos in 1246, Bishop of Aleppo in 1247 [?], and Maphrian, or Primate of the Jacobites, in Chaldæa, Assyria, and Mesopotamia, in 1266." That Abulfaraj's Christian name was

Gregory; that he was himself a physician like his father; that he died in 1286; that he was "appointed" Maphrian years before he could occupy his seat as such "in 1206"; that he resided at Tekrit on the Tigris, facts clearly stated by Lagarde, and subject to no critical doubts—all this is forgotten in this one sentence biography of the famous Jacobite, not to speak of other interesting points. Almost exactly equal space, and much more minute attention, is devoted in the 'Religious Encyclopædia' to Jacob Abbott, an American writer as dear, it is true, to children as the Syrian is to theologians and historians, and "mentioned here because of his 'Young Christian Series,' . . . a series which has been extensively circulated." And the life of Jacob Abbott is incomparably fuller than that of King David, which, after telling where and when he was born and died, immediately proceeds thus: "While a fugitive from Saul, he headed a band of freebooters"; then devotes six lines to the cave of Adullam, which ought to be given under that head; and finishes the narrative in fourteen more lines—the whole presenting a unique biographical sketch of the warrior king, in which there is absolutely no mention of Samuel or Jonathan, Michal or Abigail, Gath or Ziklag, Joab or Abishai, Philistines or Syrians, Moab or Ammon, Bathsheba or Uriah, Nathan or Gad, Absalom or Ahithophel, Adonijah or Solomon. This is substituted by the associate editor, Rev. Samuel M. Jackson, for Orelli's nine pages of close historical narrative in the 'Real-Encyclopædie,' and is drawn out into a page by some very superficial remarks on psalms and text criticism, and some twaddle on David as "the man after God's own heart," all of the trite old pattern, but including the original discovery that Kuenen "slighted David's claims upon the enthusiasm of the Church, and sought to emphasize his faults," so that he "might sneer at his religion."

The omission of almost all the events in the life of David in the sketch devoted to him is not to be attributed to an editorial rule excluding or limiting the narration of facts popularly well known or easily discoverable in the household Bible. Far from it. The abridgment of Herzog's "Abraham" reproduces only the stories, so well known to every Sunday-school pupil, about the patriarch's wanderings, Lot and Sarah, Hagar and Ishmael, Melchizedek and Abimelech, angelic apparitions and divine revelations; everything historico-critical is left out, and there is not even an allusion to the age in which the father of the Hebrew nation is believed to have lived. Nor is there a chronological date attached to any of the heroes of the legendary or semi-legendary periods of Hebrew history whom we can discover in this volume—ending with the letter F—such as Aaron, Abimelech, Barak, Caleb, Deborah, or Eli, while such interesting characters as Agag, Boaz, and Ehud are completely forgotten, though the insignificant Abdon is noticed. The abridger of Orelli's "Debora," by the by, makes her enemy Sisera, King Jabin's captain, a "Canaanitish King," and has this "King, Sisera, . . . executed . . . in the tent of Jael." The reader will in vain look for historical dates under "Chronology," for there he finds only: "See 'Era,'" and "Era" naturally reproduces only Herzog's "Äre" (by Orelli), while Herzog's "Zeitrechnung"—embracing sixty-three pages in vol. xviii., and twenty-seven in vol. xxii., of the first edition—is still to come. Thus Schaff's "Chronology" is also still to come—in a supplement; and with it we may also have an "Andrew," an "Athaliah," an "Azariah," and the other forgotten notices—say, after Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible,' the pages of which Dr. Schaff and his associates might have turned over more diligently than they did—and also the ar-

title "Accad," already referred to in the book. The last named notice would be very well done by Prof. Francis Brown, whose contributions to this volume, including "Cuneiform Inscriptions" and "Eden," show him to be perfectly familiar with the latest products of Assyriology, and a painstaking and careful scholar.

Let us add, in justice to Dr. Schaff and his associates—whose undertaking we cannot but recognize as not less arduous than useful—that Prof. Brown's are not the only original American contributions that deserve commendation; that many an abridgment appears to be well executed; and that many an omission is due to too much reliance upon Herzog's guidance. Thus, the 'Real-Encyclopædie,' the plan of which is somewhat peculiar, has no "Agag," "Asarja," "Athaliah," "Boas," or "Ehud" either. If Schaff's abridger leaves "Ahab" without a chronological mark, and furnishes "Ahaz" and "Abaziah" with dates, he only follows the example of the German writer, F. W. Schultz, whose reason in not dating the reign of Ahab was probably the desire to ignore the conflict between the Biblical and Assyrian chronologies arising from the mention, in the Assyrian inscriptions, of Ahabu Sir'lai, identified with Ahab of Israel, as a contemporary of Shalmaneser II. Ignoring at one place, however, does not remove the discrepancy; for, returning to Schaff, already, under "Azariah"—"the son and successor of Ahab . . . (B.C. 897-886)"—and also under "Elijah," we find Ahab dead in 897, while, under "Ben-hadad," we read that "the Assyrian King, Shalmaneser II. (B.C. 854-823), . . . thoroughly in agreement with the Bible [*sic*]," says that, at the time of his first expedition against Ben-hadad II. of Syria, "the Syrian king was in league with 'Achabhu'—i. e., Ahab of Israel." The 'Real-Encyclopædie,' too, betrays under "Ahasja" and "Elia" what it suppresses under "Ahab"; but it has no "Ben-hadad," its "Syria" and "Shalmaneser" are still to come, and from "Assyrien" all trouble is removed by reference to "Nineve." Whether it will in the Assyrian articles, like the 'Religious Encyclopædia,' compromise the Biblical chronology and vitiate its earlier notices by adopting the common Assyriological date for the reign of Shalmaneser, or adopt Oppert's view of a break in the Assyrian Eponym Canon, remains to be seen. In any case, it is a question of consistency only, and not of orthodoxy; for surely neither of the two cyclopædias can be reproached with want of reverence for the inspiration and the text of the Bible, though both dare to question occasionally the correctness of a word or a figure. Dr. Schaff's orthodoxy is particularly broad and deep. It colors every article with the tenor of which critical scepticism can have anything to do, even after all that Herzog's conservatism has done in defence of authenticity or belief. In regard to the fundamental Christian tenets, we have from the pen of the veteran writer on religious topics, at the close of the long article, "Christology"—an article evidently intended to be his own crowning contribution—the following confession of faith, which speaks for itself:

"We accept fully the faith of the Church in all ages, and consider the divinity of our Lord as the corner-stone of Christianity. We hold, with Rothe and Ritschl, to the moral nature of the God-manhood of Christ, but without sacrificing his eternal divinity. We would go as far with the Kenosis theory as the unchangeable nature of God permits and as the unbounded love of God demands. We dissent from the dyophysitic and dualistic psychology of Chalcedon, and hold to the inseparable personal unity of the life, and at the same time to the genuine growth, of Christ, without asserting, with the Kenoticists, a growth of the divine Logos, who is unchangeable in his nature; but we substitute

for this impossible idea a gradual communication of the divinity to the God-man."

The intense Biblical religious sentiment which pervades Dr. Schaff's 'Encyclopædia' manifests itself not only in the defence of the often-assailed genuineness or remote antiquity of such books as Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Chronicles, and even Daniel—Chronicles is called "thoroughly reliable history," and Daniel is defended against so orthodox a scholar as Franz Delitzsch—but it also radiates charity and admiration over the Jewish spirit and literature of the rabbinical periods. Thus we read, under "Education," that the schools of Tiberias and Jerusalem poured forth in the two Talmuds "a stream of varied learning unparalleled in history." Not satisfied with this eulogium, the writer quotes, apparently from an article in McClintock and Strong's 'Cyclopædia,' the following extraordinary statement: "The Talmud is an encyclopædia of all the sciences of that time, and shows that in many departments of science these Jewish teachers have anticipated modern discoveries." We would exclaim, "Uredat Judæus!" were it not for the circumstance that the Talmud is best known to Jews. In this sad time of Rahlfs and Stöckers, Jews may be delighted by learned defences of the Talmud like Delitzsch's, but glorifications of it based on hearsay or pan-theological sentimentality no more touch a chord in the Jewish heart than, for instance, the full statement, under "Egypt," how, by the ten plagues, "in order the following gods were mocked: (1) Osiris, the great god of the Nile, the sacred river; (2) Hek, the 'driver away of frogs'; (3) and (4) the fly gods; (5) the sacred ram worshipped at Thebes, and the sacred ox at Memphis and On," etc. To Jewish students, at least, the worldly science of the Talmud and the plagues of Egypt are of little account. May our readers pardon this digression.

Lectures on Art. Delivered in support of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. By Reginald Stuart Poole, Prof. W. B. Richmond, E. J. Poynter, J. T. Micklethwaite, and William Morris. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1882.

THE gentlemen whose lectures make up this attractive volume are all men of distinguished attainments as artists or special students of art, and the lectures themselves will repay attentive perusal. The introductory discourse, by Mr. Poole, keeper of coins in the British Museum, treats of the Egyptian tomb and the Egyptian idea of the future state. The architecture and art of the ancient Egyptians were, as he points out, so intimately associated with their religious beliefs, and especially with that concerning a future state, that they cannot be understood independently. The construction and decoration of the tomb are carefully examined, and the manner in which these have resulted from the peculiar religious beliefs is explained. A fact of startling significance to students of archaeology, to which Mr. Poole calls attention, is that whereas the paintings of these Egyptian tombs were preserved essentially intact from remote antiquity till within the past thirty years, they have now nearly perished—owing largely to the indiscretion and violence of explorers and travellers.

Professor Richmond's lecture is on monumental painting. In the course of his remarks, we think he draws the line somewhat too sharply between monumental and decorative painting, as if they were two distinct classes of art. We conceive, on the contrary, that all good monumental art has a strictly decorative basis. The frescoes at Assisi, for instance, illustrate this; they illumi-

nate the walls and roofs precisely as the ornamental devices of the mediæval scribes do the pages of a missal. It is the same with all the great frescoes of the Italian schools, even with those of Correggio at Parma. The decorative element does not disappear till the decline of painting, under the late Renaissance. Much might be said on this point did our space allow. We cannot, however, do more than to add that, in our judgment, the decorative element, when rightly understood, is an integral part of all good painting whatever. That is to say, any picture, however realistic, and whether associated with architecture or not, ought to be so designed as to present an arrangement of lines, lights and shades, or color masses, which shall be agreeable to the eye, even when no regard is had to anything else. All narrative, didactic, or other expressional motive must be based upon this as a primal scheme, or else we shall not have a work of art in the truest sense.

Mr. Richmond (pp. 29, 30) calls attention to the methodical, deliberate, and precise nature of Italian painting; and he argues that the chaste and severe character of Italian design in fresco is owing to the peculiar nature of the fresco process. This last we take to be not wholly true, for chasteness and severity of design are constant in all early and central Italian art, whether in fresco or tempera; and they are equally constant in the architecture and sculpture. These qualities have their origin in the Italian genius rather than in the peculiarities of any technical process. The fact is noted that the excellence of Italian art is largely due to the close connection which was maintained between architecture, sculpture, and painting—the three being very commonly practised by the same person—and that this association of the arts is necessary to the normal development of each. He touches, too, upon a point of much importance respecting the nature of Masaccio's combined realism and classic design, and remarks truly (p. 51) that this master shows "what true realistic painting may be without loss of dignity." There has been a great deal of confused thought and teaching about the idealization of form in Italian design as derived from the example of the Greeks. But in truth there was nothing of the kind in the early and central schools of Italy. The Italians possessed, by native inheritance and tradition, instincts of design akin to those of the Greeks; but they studied and represented nature as they found it, incorporating into beautiful compositions forms which often (as in the case of Masaccio's works) were positively ugly when considered by themselves as types of beauty. It was not until the true life of art was dying in Italy that artists began to idealize form in the common sense of the term.

The third lecture, by Mr. E. J. Poynter, appears to us the least instructive of the series. His subject is ancient decorative art, but he gives very little information; the larger part of the discourse being devoted to a conjectural consideration of the character of Greek painting. In the absence of all remains whereby to form a clear conception, Mr. Poynter infers this and that about Greek painting. His inferences seem sometimes plausible, it is true, as where, concerning the art of Polygnotus, he judges that since the sculptures of the pediments of Ægina were executed just before the time when this master exercised his talents, his outlines would probably be at least as perfect as theirs. But this and kindred argument, belonging to the domain of curious speculation, are not what we want as the substance of a lecture on ancient decorative art.

Mr. Micklethwaite treats of the development of English parish churches from the monastic plan, introduced by the Italian missionaries, and the secular, which was a continuation of the

British type. In the course of his remarks he says some very good things about restoration, and about the fallacy of the idea that the original style of a church which has been altered according to the successive wants of the people for perhaps a thousand years, can always be determined, or is worth restoring by the sacrifice of all these historic accumulations and associations.

The fifth and sixth lectures are by Mr. William Morris. The first of these is on "The History of Pattern Designing," and the second on "The Lesser Arts of Life." Both are mainly characterized by the general good sense with which Mr. Morris always expresses himself. In the early part of the first lecture (p. 139) he disconnects ancient from mediæval art rather too absolutely, in our opinion; and we are not quite sure whether by the remark on p. 142, that the realistic tendency of Assyrian art, "had it lived longer, would most likely have driven it out of the path of monumental and decorative art," he means to affirm that a realistic character in art is necessarily inconsistent with what is monumental and decorative. We could not agree with such an idea so long as the Parthenon sculptures and Tintoret's Crucifixion and many other such examples are before our minds. The important fact that the lesser arts cannot be separated from the greater—that they always depend upon the greater—is clearly and well stated, and this statement may be useful to those who suppose that the art which concerns itself with beautifying the products of industry is essentially different from higher art, and may be cultivated by different means. Mr. Morris argues forcibly in favor of that true art cultivation for artisans which will make them happy in the consciousness of ability to produce what is really beautiful—a cultivation which can result only from training of the perceptions and tastes without any direct reference to utilitarian ends.

Dorothea Scott. Oxford: Parkers. 1882.

THIS monograph of twenty-eight pages, printed for private circulation, was prepared by Mr. G. D. Scull, an Anglo-American who has already done good service by his volume on 'The Evelyns in America,' noticed in these columns. Mr. Scull has made a special study of the relations between our early English visitors and settlers and the mother country, and among the family papers of some old English country homes he has found much valuable original material throwing light on persons of note in both countries. Wootton supplied him with curious details of successive generations of Evelyns who tried their fortunes on this side the Atlantic. The Journals of Col. Montresor, of the British Engineers, with the record of his services in this country in the old French War and in the Revolution, are being printed in the *Magazine* of the Pennsylvania Historical Society, from the originals in possession of the present representative of the family. Dorothea Scott has a more purely personal interest for Mr. Scull and his kinsfolk, for from the three elaborate pedigrees appended to his pamphlet she figures as the ancestress of the Sculls, Woods, Tysons, and other well-known Jersey and Pennsylvania Quaker families, and thus connects them with the Scotts, who trace their descent back to Henry III. and through a long line of royal and noble names. But for the general reader, Dorothea Scott's story is a curious bit of domestic grief, well worth studying as illustrative of her time.

She was the youngest daughter of a Scott, of Egerton, and his wife, a Knatchbull, whose present representative, now Lord Brabourne, is well known for his share in English politics and literature. She was born in 1611, and was heiress in her own right of an estate in Kent of

£500 a year; and having first married a Major Daniel Gotherson, who died in 1666, she afterwards married a man named Hogben. Before 1660 she and Gotherson joined the Society of Friends, and her meeting went under the name of Scott's Congregation, from her success as a preacher. About 1662, at Whitehall, in the presence of the King, she met a John Scott who claimed relationship and made good use of her credulity. She and her husband paid him large sums of money for lands in Long Island, and made him their agent for the purchase of still larger tracts which he said he had bought on their account directly from the Indians. About 1667 she undertook, through Governor Lovelace, to get at the truth, and promised, in case of a favorable report from him, to "goe over to New Yorke and carry an hundred and twenty families with her to the great advantage of ye Place"; but Lovelace and his brother could find no trace of any lands belonging to Scott or to her. Worse still, she had intrusted to Scott her only son, under promise of preferment and of advancing his fortune, and Lovelace found that Scott had sold the lad to an innkeeper at New Haven, from whom he was redeemed by the payment of seven pounds. Her petition to the King, that Lovelace should be ordered to examine her claim, was referred to the Duke of York, as the Chief Proprietary of New York, and by him to our old friend Samuel Pepys, then Secretary of the Admiralty, to collect evidence against Scott.

It is owing to the careful, business-like solicitude of Pepys that the few writings touching Dorothea Scott's case were preserved, and it was out of his zeal for the establishment of her claim that Pepys fell under the machination of John Scott, and was long put to trouble and vexation before he could effectually clear himself from the aspersions cast upon him by that unscrupulous and plotting adventurer. Pepys set to work with characteristic thoroughness, and brought together a great number of depositions and informations as to Scott's dishonest proceedings in New England, Long Island, Barbadoes, France, Holland, and England. He reported that Scott had sold the Gothersons (Dorothea Scott and her husband) 20,000 acres of land in Long Island, although he did not own a foot there; he made the Gothersons pay large sums for timber to build houses on their land; he even got poor Dorothea's jewels, and showed them, among others, to "Col. Lewis Morris, an eminent planter and great Quaker in Barbadoes," who bought £200 of his Long Island perpetuities or leases for 999 years.

Scott declared that he would be revenged upon Pepys, and, to this end, joined a band of desperate malcontents, among them the notorious Dr. Titus Oates, and hatched a conspiracy against the Government as well as against Pepys. They accused him of being a Papist and keeping a priest in his house, and alleged that Sir Anthony Deane (a famous shipbuilder for the Government) and himself were friendly to the King of France, and treasonably furnished him with secret information as to the strength of the navy. Other charges were made against Pepys in Parliament, and a discharged servant was induced to commit perjury to sustain the charges. Pepys was seized and committed to the Tower; bail was for some time refused, but at last he was allowed his liberty on giving security in £30,000. It was eight months before the case came on for trial; in the meantime the servant confessed his perjuries on his death-bed. Pepys sent queries to Dorothea Scott, who again recounted her grievances at the hands of her rascally kinsman, adding that her old family jewels were worn by the wife of the man who had cheated her out of them, for Scott, in one

of his visits to New York, had married Deborah, daughter of Joseph Rayner, of Southampton, Long Island. Poor Peyps was long cut off from the King's friendship for his share of the business, but finally established the truth of his charges against Scott and his own innocence.

In 1680, Dorothea Scott and her family came to Long Island, no doubt to secure a grant of land as compensation for her losses. Her youngest daughter married a Welsh emigrant, John Davis—one of the sect called "Singing Quakers"—who lived at Oyster Bay, on Long Island, and, as his name appears on the assessor's list for 1683 rated at £40 per annum, presumably a man of substance. In 1705, he followed his sons to Salem County, New Jersey, and from them the blood of Dorothea Scott, the representative of kings of England and Scotland, runs in the veins of the Quakers of that peaceful region. A more creditable kinsman was Richard Scott, one of the earliest settlers of Rhode Island, and a sturdy Quaker, whose wife wrote a strong letter of remonstrance to Governor John Winthrop, protesting against those whom "the world in scorn calls quakers."

Of John Scott's subsequent fate little is known, and although Mr. Scull has not told that little in this sketch of his ancestress, he has in preparation a full memoir of that knavish agent, for the New York Historical Society, and it is satisfactory to learn that the arch-scamper had at least to seek safety in exile in Norway—the Alsatia of the English rogues of the seventeenth century—and that only in his extreme old age was he again allowed to enjoy a small pension and to return home to die. How far poor Dorothea's only son profited by his harsh experience in being sold to service is nowhere told, although Lovelace in his report says that he "putt him to school in New Yorke, where hee much improved himselfe." The whole story is of interest in itself, and of value as showing what side-lights are thrown on contemporary history in the pursuit of genealogical researches.

The Still-Hunter. By Theodore S. Van Dyke. Fords, Howard & Hulbert.

It is a good sign of the increasing intelligent interest taken in field-sports in this country that the literature on the subject is being thought worthy the efforts of men who know what they write about, and are able to express their ideas in a clear and interesting manner. Mr. Van Dyke's book on still-hunting shows that he has carefully and lovingly studied the art (for art it is), and his minute and exhaustive instructions, derived from personal experience, cannot but be as instructive to those trying to surmount the difficulties of still-hunting for deer, as they are interesting to all who have but a general and undeveloped taste for wood-life and the chase. The man who goes to the Adirondack lakes in July and August, and shoots a deer stupefied by the light of a jack at ten yards' distance, or held by the tail in the water by his partner in crime, the guide, may perhaps feel, after reading fifty pages of this book, that he is not the true sportsman his fancy has led him to think, and that rectitude and skill in deer-shooting are as difficult to live up to and acquire as almost any of the graces and arts of life. Mr. Van Dyke's book is almost wholly one of instruction; and to those whose idea of a "still-hunt" is largely indebted to the rather vague recent use of the term in a political sense, it will prove a revelation.

Still-hunting is, beyond doubt, the most scientific of all sports, especially in a country where deer have been much shot at; and at the same time, when followed by an expert, it is the most certain in its results. Mr. Van

Dyke assumes that his reader is a tyro, and takes him along from the first to the ninth chapter before his education in woodcraft and venery suffices to get him a shot at the game, though it is plentiful on the ground he travels over. These nine chapters are all of great interest, and admirably ordered. The first great difficulty in still-hunting is to get a sight of a deer at all. When you have overcome that, the second one presents itself, which is to see the animal near enough to shoot at it. The rolling, wooded country into which Mr. Van Dyke takes us is the most favorable for still-hunting, and now, "after several days of blighted hopes have passed over your head, on some of which you have seen nothing but tracks and occasional long jumps, and on others only a tail or two glimmering out of sight in the dark depths of timber or over a ridge," he allows you experience enough to bring you within shot of a deer. She (for it is a doe) first appears on

"a ridge a hundred and fifty yards away, just dimly visible through the cloud of twigs and branches of intervening trees. It can hardly be a deer; it looks small and dark, and lacks all that graceful outline of the deer engraved on the lock-plate of your gun. Its head, too, is low down, and projecting like that of a long-necked goat, while its nether extremity looks awkwardly angular, like that of a cow."

The fidelity of this description can be proved by any one who has had the rare pleasure of watching a doe strolling leisurely through the woods. She comes on within thirty yards of the hunter, he bleats to stop her, and

"Presto! what a change! at the sound the awkward-looking thing is resolved, as by the stroke of an enchanter's wand, into all the grace and symmetry of the artist's deer. It stands in the light of the rising sun with sleek and shiny coat, rotund with fatness; its dark eyes are turned inquiringly toward you; its delicate ears are turned forward to catch the slightest sound."

The doe is shot at, and missed through being too sure, but an hour or two later another chance occurs, and the first deer is killed.

Fifteen more very interesting chapters are devoted to hunting under almost every conceivable condition of locality, weather, and habits of the game, which vary wonderfully, according to their surroundings. Then follow nine chapters devoted almost entirely to the rifle, showing as much close study, research, and rhetorical clearness as those preceding; and a concluding one on "moccasins, buckskin, etc."—the "etc." being a few pages of most excellent advice and hints—finishes altogether the best and most complete American book we have yet seen on any branch of field-sports. We hope Mr. Van Dyke will not consider us invidious in alluding to one error of belief he labors under, when he states, on page 25, that he "has never known a deer to eat what is known as 'dry feed'—to wit, sun-dried grass." We have seen in Michigan, in October, a small stack of wild hay much plucked out and eaten by deer, and in the winter, along certain logging-roads, deer are certain to come out of the swamps and eat the "tame hay" which has fallen from the loads going through to the lumbering camps.

The Home Needle. By Ella Rodman Church.—*Home Occupations.* By Janet E. Runtz-Rees. D. Appleton & Co.

To our thinking no one of the series of "Home Books" is so much to be commended as either of the two before us. The first is an intelligible and simple manual from which to learn all the kinds of sewing which are essential to make a family comfortable and a home attractive. Not dress-making only, but the house-linen and the mending-basket receive due attention. The sensible comments scattered through it are a needed

corrective for the mistaken notion, unhappily gaining ground, that the sewing-machine is to supplant the old "home needle." Undoubtedly, it lessens the number of hours to be spent over long seams, but no machine can *finish*, and, besides, machine sewing is only too apt to make the worker careless and slack about the finishing. Every woman should know practically how to sew, if for no other purpose than to gain a rational idea of what should be expected of seamstresses and such work-people.

"Home Occupations" brings a refreshing memory of an older time when it was permissible to enjoy a thing because it was pretty, without painful questionings as to sincerity or high art. "The Possibilities of Tissue Paper," and "What Can be Done with Beads," may be suggestions horrifying to those initiated in the mysteries of current taste, but the craze for ceramics and crewels implies well filled purses, while bright leaves and nutshells are to be had for the seeking, and there are plain folk, and gentle folk withal, who can find much pleasure in the dainty and inexpensive devices with which the book is filled.

The writer has very successfully carried out her purpose, which was, not to suggest definite plans or rules for regular employment, but to find pleasant ways of filling hours not spent in the active pursuit either of business or amusement. With all our ever-increasing desire to acquire "accomplishments," there must be a great many persons who never attain excellence either in music or painting, while there are others to whom the leisure for such employments comes too late in life for them ever to gain technical skill. To all such the making of pretty things which need only patience and natural cleverness is a delightful resource, and this book to them will be most helpful. Two chapters might easily lead to actual scientific study. From "The Preservation of Flowers, Grasses, and Seaweeds" to the study of their structure and habits is but a step. (May we add in passing that botany is the one natural science which no girl should fail to study? Of nothing is it more true that the delight of youth will be the solace of age.) "Amateur Photography" is almost sure to teach something of chemistry, and to develop somewhat of artistic taste. It is strange we have been so long in coming to it. It is five and twenty years since "Claude Mellot" undertook it, in Kingsley's "Two Years Ago." One use of it does not appear to have occurred to the writer, though it is as simple as it is valuable—the copying of prints or drawings not otherwise to be obtained. There lies before us a photograph of a map of the Scotch lakes taken ten years ago from a then rare book. A large class in a high school who were reading the "Lady of the Lake" were supplied with copies that cost practically nothing.

Beowulf, an Anglo-Saxon Poem; and the Fight at Finnsburg. Translated by James M. Garnett, M.A., LL.D. Pp. xl-107. Boston: Ginn & Heath. 1882.

A FEW months ago we had the pleasure of noting the appearance of Professor Harrison's edition of the "Beowulf" text. Before the end of the year Professor Garnett surprised us with his modern rendering of the noble old poem. That there was need of such a version no one will hesitate to admit. Kemble's rendering, made in 1837, was not only out of print and excessively rare, but even when procurable could be of little service, being based on an antiquated text. Colonel Lumsden's rhyming version, published in 1881, might enable the general reader to form a tolerable estimate of the more striking literary features of the poem, but to the genuine student of Anglo-Saxon could be little more than a

stumbling block. It was faulty in plan and careless in execution, whereas the present work is evidently the ripe fruit of genuine scholarship. A glance at the introduction alone, irrespective of the translation, will make this clear. Pages xxiii.-xxviii. contain the fullest bibliography that has ever yet been prepared on the subject. It supersedes the work of all previous editors, German or English.

Professor Garnett's general remarks and criticisms are also admirable. As to the translation itself, we have not merely read it with great satisfaction, but have examined two test passages with all possible care. The first is the description of Beowulf's fight with Grendel (pp. 22-26); the second is the narrative of the robbing of the dragon's cave (pp. 67-71). The fight with Grendel is one of the easiest to read in the entire poem, and on that account probably all the harder to render. It is unquestionably the most graphic bit of alliterative verse in Germanic literature. We do not say that Professor Garnett has reproduced all the directness and fire of the original; our modern speech is not adequate to the task. But we do judge that within the limits of a line-for-line and word-for-word rendering the translator has had remarkable success. He has felt the sustained power and dignity of the original, and imparts a just sense thereof to his readers. The second passage is difficult for a very different reason. It is one of those tangled, obscure preambles which are the sorest test of one's patience. The MS. is woefully corrupt. Grein, Heyne, and other editors, by dint of conjectural restorations that seem akin to inspiration, have succeeded in making sense out of broken letters and ugly lacunæ. The translator has toiled painfully in their footsteps and smoothed down the path still more. No one, we venture to say, will have the first conception of such efforts unless he put Grein's or Heyne's text by the side of this English, and then compare them all with Wülcker's reprint of the MS. in his new edition of Grein's 'Bibliothek.' It is like stepping back from daylight into "chaos and old night."

We have no space here for the minutiae of criticism, although we have noted several words and phrases for correction. Such corrections belong in a technical journal of philology. We prefer to dwell upon the general merits of the rendering, and to congratulate American scholarship upon having at last achieved in our speech of today a thoroughly honest and intelligible reproduction of our earliest great poem. If the translator has erred at all, it has been in the direction of too great literalness. By occasionally sacrific-

ing the Anglo-Saxon construction, and using more freely words of Latin origin, he would, we believe, have made his lines smoother and their meaning more obvious. But the point is a debatable one, and we do not offer it as more than a suggestion. At any rate, whoever, philologist or not, will use Professor Garnett's translation faithfully, will find in it the best possible aid to his own understanding or interpretation of an unusually difficult subject.

Early New England People: Some Account of the Ellis, Pemberton, Willard, Prescott, Titcomb, Sewall and Longfellow, and allied Families. By Sarah Elizabeth Titcomb. Boston: W. B. Clarke & Carruth. 1882.

To work out from one's family as a centre, and gratify one's curiosity by tracing more or less fully its connections by blood and marriage, is a natural impulse for the genealogist, especially the neophyte. To publish a selection from such a correlated group of ancestors, especially if there be plenty of talent and distinction to adorn it, would also seem natural, and this is what Miss Titcomb has done, though we do not now recall another instance. The names mentioned in the title are a guarantee of the widespread interest which the volume before us possesses; but we can add Sir Wm. Pepperell, Judge Haliburton, Robert Treat Paine, Gen. Return Jonathan Meigs, Margaret Fuller, Harriet Prescott Spofford, Harriet Hosmer, the Everts and Hoar families, Gen. Wm. F. Bartlett, and many others. There is no lack of romance, particularly in the case of the Ellises; and some of the biographical sketches of the elder worthies have for non-scholarly readers an obvious convenience and value. The great drawback, however, to the usefulness of the work arises from the author's want of literary dexterity and her defective chronological sense, which last, quite as much, perhaps, as inexperience in book-making, has prevented a clear arrangement. The employment of different kinds and sizes of type and of the conventional genealogical enumeration would have brought out in relief the relationships which it is the author's object to display, and which a skeleton chart would still further have elucidated. It must be said, also, that authorities are rather loosely cited, and that the general pedigrees inspire more distrust than perhaps, with the counsel and assistance at Miss Titcomb's command, they deserve. The book is handsomely printed.

The Iliad of Homer, done into English Prose by Andrew Lang, M.A., Walter Leaf, M.A., and Ernest Myers, M.A. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

BUTCHER and Lang's translation of the Odyssey has been generally recognized as an excellent work. It has been widely recommended by Homeric scholars, and most readers have been delighted with it. Now we have a translation of the Iliad done on the same plan and in part by one of the same persons. If it does not attain the same popularity, the chief reason, we presume, will be the different nature of the poem, which is not perhaps so well represented in this smooth, evenly-flowing prose as the more quiet narrative of the Odyssey. Besides, the version is not quite so successful as in the former case, though the difference is not very great. The slight affectation of archaism in language which in the Odyssey offended some critics, is somewhat increased in this new volume, and there are passages here and there in which, to a careful and loving student of the poem, the present translators will seem to have missed the connection of thought or the point of some special word. Still, we are thankful to have the general impression of the poem thus faithfully reproduced for the many readers who have not time for the study of the original. We cannot help also being glad that the opinion of the two new translators prevailed so far as to introduce *k* and *os* instead of *c* and *us* in the spelling of proper names (though Olympus and Corinth are admitted). The wide circulation which this book deserves and will obtain will do a great deal to familiarize people outside of scholarly circles with these forms, which will certainly, we think, in time prevail over the Latinized forms that have been so long in use. Mr. Myers's introductory sonnet deserves notice as a fit companion to that which Mr. Lang prefixed to the Odyssey.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Thoms, J. A. A Complete Concordance of the Revised Version of the New Testament. Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.50.
Thorold, A. W. The Claims of Christ on the Young. A. D. F. Randolph & Co. 90 cents.
Townsend, L. T. Bible Theology and Modern Thought. Boston: Lee & Shepard. \$1.50.
Trimble, Esther J. A Hand-book of English and American Literature, for Schools and Academies. Philadelphia: Kildredge & Brother. \$1.50.
Tyrrell, R. Y. Dublin Translations into Greek and Latin Verse. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co.
Vinton, J. A. The Richardson Memorial: Full History and Genealogy of the Posterity of Three Brothers—Ezekiel, Samuel, and Thomas Richardson. Portland: Hoyt, Fogg & Donham.
Whitelaw, R. Sophocles, Translated into English Verse. London: Rivingtons; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.
Whist, or Bumblepuppy? Ten Lectures Addressed to Children. Boston: Roberts Bros.

Henry Holt & Co.

HAVE READY:

Evolution and Christianity.

By J. F. Yorke. 12mo, \$1.50.

An attempt to point out the bearing of Evolution upon Religion, and especially upon Christianity.

GOSSE'S

On Viol and Flute.

Selected Poems. By Edmond W. Gosse. 12mo, \$1.75.

TEN BRINK'S

Early English Literature.

Translated by Prof. H. M. Kennedy. Large 12mo, \$2.25.

Sibylline Leaves.

By A. E. M. K. 16mo, cloth, gilt, \$2.

A tasteful and ingenious little work which does "fortune-telling" by giving extracts from the poets in response to questions regarding one's destiny.

WALKER'S

Political Economy.

By Francis A. Walker, President Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Large 12mo, \$2.25.

BROWNING'S

Lyrical and Dramatic Poems

Selected from his Works by E. T. Mason. Square 12mo, \$2.

HENRY HOLT & CO., New York.

A Word

ONLY A WORD.

A Romance. From the German of

GEORG EBERS.

Author of 'Uarda,' etc.

One vol., paper, 50 cents; cloth, 90 cents.

WILLIAM S. GOTTSBERGER, Publisher.

No. 11 Murray Street, New York.

At all bookstores, and by mail on receipt of price.

IN any family, whether large or small, but especially where the number of children is large, a record of the constitutional peculiarities of each one, and the whole course of its physical development in sickness and in health, is certain to be instructive and may prove invaluable. Such a record is Professor J. B. Fossagrives's 'Mother's Register,' consisting of a series of tables scientifically arranged for brief and convenient entries. A separate volume for boys and for girls. Price, post-paid, 75 cents per volume, or \$1.25 for two volumes. Address Publisher of the Nation.

ra
in
p
p
se
re
p
b
in
th
th
T
s
b
l
is
re
b
th
p